

R O M A N S

by
G. Stoeckhardt

The complete text translated
by
Edward W. Schade
and edited by
Otto F. Stahlke

Concordia Theological Seminary Printshop
1984

PREFACE

The Letter to the Romans is admittedly the principal doctrinal writing of the New Testament. Therefore in its exposition the exegete must set forth its principal doctrinal teaching. That is not possible without an exact examination of the text and the context. The undersigned endeavored in the work under consideration to take into account first the linguistic side of the Letter, and, above all, the eternal, divine truths which have been expressed in this apostolic Epistle, in order to bring himself and the reader to the correct awareness of its message. The historical interest, in which many late exegetes treat biblical books and especially the Letters of the Apostles, dare not boast of any special scientific methodology. Every book must be judged by its own character and by its own purpose. The function and purpose of the Holy Scriptures is clear of itself and is significantly expressed by Paul in II Th 3:16.

The method used in this commentary is the integrated exposition and application as found, for example, in Hofmann, Godet, and principally in Philippi. This appears to me to serve the above-named purpose of the exposition best of all. In the so-called glossatory method (verse by verse), which binds itself to the grammatical plan and factual content of the individual constituent parts of the text, one loses the train of thought and the connection of the thoughts. On the other hand, when one treats the grammatical, lexicographic, historical, archaeological material in his remarks and confines the real exegetical exposition to a free reproduction of the contents of the Letter, as has happened in many of the latest commentaries, those things which are closely bound together, namely, language and circumstance, form and content, are torn asunder. The biblical text is here foremost and must therefore by all means remain the central point of the matter under consideration. It is the business of the expositor to bring out the sense and content of the words which are there written. Therefore the exposition dare never

hover over the text as an independent product of the mind. No commentator has succeeded completely in separating the linguistic discussion from the connecting development of thoughts. In this case the exegete must scrupulously weigh how much of the linguistic material he will take into the exposition of the text, how much he will relegate to the notes. And the reader is obligated to continually look up and down.

Every new commentator on the Letter to the Romans must self-evidently take into consideration the previous expositions. In his Preface to his Commentar zum Neuen Testament Zahn has correctly called attention to the fact that no commentator offers room enough to discuss all the possible and impossible interpretations together with their supporting arguments, but that the present-day expositor should present to his readers all matters worthy of note, which in the course of the centuries have been brought forth for the clarification of the biblical text. In the first volume of his work, in the exposition of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, he refrained too much from citing old and new exegetes by name. In our commentary we have sought to make known all these interpretations, which alter the sense of an important passage and thereby the doctrine of Paul, as misinterpretations. On the other hand, we want to permit the ancient and modern expositors to speak for themselves there where they have on occasion presented and clarified the meaning of the Apostle in an especially conclusive manner. The fact that Luther has once again brought the Gospel of Paul into the open and opened up to Christianity the understanding of the central doctrine of justification, justifies the fact that we have made more abundant use of the testimonies from the age of the Reformation, than has been done in recent commentaries.

What has been said in other introductions on the Letter to the Romans, I wish to supplement here with a few words. The exposition of the Letter by Lipsius in the Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament was out of print. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans by the Rev. Wm. Sanday and the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, 11th edition, 1906, came to my notice too late. In a perusal of the same I have run across no explanation of any important passage which is decisive for the teaching of Paul, which is not already found in earlier commentaries.

The newest treatment of the Letter to the Romans by H. Lietzmann and F. Niebergall in the Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 1906, which in its brevity and in its linguistic consideration, is very deficient, has come into my hands only after the completion of this work when the printing had already been begun. The two authors named belong to the modern liberal tendency. They acknowledge that Paul had taught essentially as the Church of Christ has understood him from the beginning; they see in Paul the founder of ecclesiastical orthodoxy. They concede, for example, that Paul knew a pre-existent Christ, that he based justification, the forgiveness of sins, on Christ's merit and sacrificial death. But then they seek to detach that which they admit as general religious and moral content of the doctrine of Paul from the salvific facts (Heilstatsachen) and to extract it from the mythological framework (mythologischen Rahmen). With such exegetes who deny everything that is sacred and dear to a Christian, yes, who on opportunity bitterly ridicule these things, it is impossible to come to an understanding. These also, with their so-called theology, with all their thinking and invention, stand outside of the church (extra ecclesiam) and speak of Christian things as a blind man speaks about color.

May the study of the Letter to the Romans spur the Christian preachers on to walk in the footsteps of Paul, the great, divinely inspired preacher of the righteousness that avails before God!

G. Stoeckhardt

INTRODUCTION

The Author of the Letter

That Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, has written the Letter which we have received as the Letter of Paul to the Romans is beyond doubt. Weiss judges correctly:

The genuineness of our Letter is so decidedly confirmed by the testimony of the orthodox Church, as also by the Gnostics, Basilides, Valentinus, etc., and even by the judaizing heretics, who rejected the worthiness of the Apostle. There exists absolutely no trace of a rejection of Pauline authorship, that, to call into question or to deny its authenticity, the most compelling inner grounds must be shown. By the complete absence of such evidence, however, the empty scruples of Evanson and the outrages of C. Baur can find no following. Throughout the Letter bears the characteristic nature of the Apostle in content and form, is the principle source of his Gospel in its entire context and contrast, and by that is also the richest original apostolic document and standard of all true, evangelical Protestantism.

The objections of Baur against the Pauline authorship of the last two chapters are likewise to be considered as obsolete and non-conclusive. As far as it appears necessary, we shall take issue with these in the exposition. The thoughtless hypotheses by such men as van Manen, Loman, Steck, Pierson and Smith of New Orleans which have recently been set forth concerning the formation of our Letter in the second century, have been unmasked as such by one of the most radical German critics, Schmiedel of Zurich (Cf. The Hibbert Journal, 1903, pp. 532-552). The Epistle of Paul to the Romans is now almost universally acknowledged and accepted as such, even on the part of the most renowned defenders of the negative critical school. As an unquestionably genuine apostolic Epistle, the Letter to the Romans is to us a part of the Scriptures, inspired by God, which can make us wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

The Roman Congregation

Concerning the formation of the Christian congregation in Rome to which our Letter is directed, we have no definite report and knowledge. The Roman tradition, first recorded by Eusebius (H.E. II, 14), according to which the Apostle Peter had come to Rome in the second year of the reign of Emperor Claudius (ca. 42 A.D.), and was supposed to have been bishop there for 25 years in the congregation which he was supposed to have established, is decidedly erroneous, as is now generally admitted even on the part of Roman theologians. At the time of the Apostolic Council (Acts 15, ca. 51 A.D.), we find Peter still in Jerusalem. If Peter had been in Rome at the time when Paul wrote his Letter to the Romans, and if he had been there as leader and elder of the congregation there, then Paul would certainly have mentioned him in his Letter; then Paul would not even have written this Letter; he would not have previously determined so often to journey to Rome, since it was contrary to his practice to infringe upon the sphere of activity of another Apostle or to build on ground not his own (Ro 15:20; 2 Cor 10:16). But we know of no other founder of the Roman congregation. The first report of the existence of a Christian congregation in Rome is given us by the Letter to the Romans itself. Concerning the beginnings of Christianity in Rome we can offer very plausible conjectures. At the first Pentecost festival in Jerusalem there were also Jews and proselytes present according to Acts 2:10, and it is very probable that some of these belonged to the 3000 who were converted by the preaching of Peter, and that they brought the seed of the Gospel along to Rome. The Christians of Jerusalem who were "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," as it is reported in Acts 11:19, travelled as far as Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch of Syria, and it is easily possible that some of them went as far as Rome, for there was connection by ship between Italy and the two lands mentioned. On the whole, in the active intercourse at that time between the synagogues at Rome and the Jews in Palestine nothing else is conceivable than that the report concerning Christ and the first Christian Church in Jerusalem

and Judaea was also broadcast in Rome, so that Roman Jews on their business trips and pilgrimages came into contact with Christianity, even became Christians themselves. Conversely, Christians of Judaea came to Rome and settled there. The report of Suetonius (Claudius 25), according to which Emperor Claudius Judaeos impulsore Christos assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit, (he expelled the Jews for causing continuous disturbances at the instigation of Christ) appears to point to the fact that through the testimony of Christ among the Jews at Rome there arose tumults, which brought about the edict of Claudius which indeed according to Dio Cassius (Hist. Rom., 60, 6), was soon withdrawn again. To those Jews driven out of Rome belonged also Aquila and Priscilla, who in Corinth were then won for Christ by Paul (Acts 18:1ff), and returned to Rome as Christians (Ro 16:3). Similar experiences might have come to other exiles. Self-evidently the Christians in Rome did not keep silence concerning the hope that was in them. As in Antioch the scattered Christians of Jerusalem proclaimed the Gospel also to the Gentiles (Acts 11:20), so certainly also the Christian Jews in Rome bore witness to the salvation in Christ, not only to their fellow-countrymen, but also to the Gentiles. When, thereafter, Paul had begun his missionary journeys, after Christian congregations had been established in the principal cities of Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, very likely in the active intercourse between Rome and the provinces of the Roman Empire many Gentile Christians of the Orient came to Rome and there took care not only of their business activities, but also furthered the cause of Christ. Yes, the little group of Roman Christians must have grown rapidly; the Word of Christ must have had good results in Rome. For the Letter of Paul to the Romans presumes the existence of a considerable congregation, and certainly an organized one (Ro 12:4). Paul writes that the faith of the Romans is reported in the whole world (Ro 1:8). Meyer and Philippi think that one must differentiate between sporadic testimony of the laity and the official activity of teaching, and that the latter is the necessary supposition for the formation and organization of a Christian congregation. They therefore assume that a man with apostolic authority, an assistant

of Paul, perhaps one of the fellow-laborers mentioned in Ro 16, had been the real founder of the Roman congregation. However, that is an entirely unnecessary hypothesis, which rests upon erroneous romanizing ideas of the Church and the office. The Christians in Rome, according to the precedence and pattern of the Christian congregations of the Orient, could very well themselves, without the assistance of an apostolic man, regulate and order their congregational life and establish teachers and elders. Some have further thought, in contradiction to Ro 1:8, that the Roman congregation must have existed for some time in quietness and hiding, because the leaders of the Jewish synagogue, whom Paul summoned to him after his arrival in Rome, had known nothing of their existence. But that is a false conclusion from Acts 28:17 ff. There it is expressly reported that this sect, which was spoken against in all places, had been well known to the leaders of the Jews. They were lacking only the exact knowledge of the Christian doctrine, for which reason they questioned Paul concerning his teaching. That is sufficiently clear from the fact that the Christians in Rome, as elsewhere, formed a communion separate and isolated from the world and from the Jewish synagogue, as also from the fact that the eminent Jews particularly ignored the despised sect of the Nazarenes. Likewise in our larger cities there are people enough, Jews and converts to Judaism, educated and uneducated, who know about the Christian Churches and congregations of their neighborhood by name, but of the Christian doctrine they know nothing.

The Roman congregation to which Paul addressed his Letter was, like all the Christian congregations outside of Palestine, made up of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Only with regard to Jewish Christians could Paul in Ro 4:1 call Abraham τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν. In 15:7ff. he admonishes both groups, the Jews and the Gentiles within the congregation, to receive one another. "Likewise, to begin with it may be surmised," says Philippi, "that the number of the Gentile Christians was predominant; for this can be described as the general, if not entirely the constant condition of the Christian congregations in the heathen lands. This is still one of the much-discussed questions among the commentators, whether in Rome the Gentile Christians or the Jewish Christians formed

the majority and gave the congregation its character. Baur, of the Tuebingen school, with regard to his entire conception of the Letter to the Romans, with all his energy defended the view that the Roman congregation had been a predominantly Jewish Christian congregation, and he has found many followers, for example, Volkmar, Holsten, von Hengel, Reuss, Thiersch, Holtzmann, and recently Zahn. This assumption, which a few decades ago reigned as the prevailing one, is connected with the subjective viewpoint of the respective commentators concerning the tendency of our Letter. As to the form and manner, for example, Zahn in his New Testament introduction refers to its subjectivism. The proofs which some have taken from the various parts of the Letter are not sound. The teaching concerning the Law and the deliverance from the Law (chapters 7 and 8) fits equally for the Gentile Christians as for the Jewish Christians. And

the many Old Testament references and demonstrations of proof testify in no way to the predominance of Jewish Christianity in Rome, but explains itself fully in the fact that all Christian instruction in the apostolic age was carried out by means of the Old Testament, and that the understanding promoted by the reading of the Law and the Prophets took place also among the Gentile Christians. (Meyer quoted in Weiss)

Therefore now the leaf has turned and the great number of the recent commentators see in the Roman congregation a predominantly Gentile Christian congregation. Thus, for example, Schott, Wieseler, Philippi, Hofmann, Meyer, Weiss, Godet, Luthardt, Weissaecher, Pfleiderer. The following reasons are decisive. In the beginning of the Letter Paul establishes himself among the readers as the Apostle to the Gentiles, who therefore has the right and the duty to teach them, to write to them (1:5-7, 13-15). To refer the expression ἐν παντί τοῖς ἔθνεσιν . . . ἐν οἷς (vv. 5, 6, "to all the nations . . . among whom") to all the nations of the earth, as, for example, Zahn does, is an exegetical act of violence. In like manner, at the end of the Letter Paul points to his apostleship to the Gentiles, which had given him the courage to write to the Romans as he had written (15:15, 16). And otherwise he addresses the readers of his Letter as ἔθνη, "Heiden," Gentiles (11:3). He writes, 11:25: Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί,

τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο. He would now impart a mystery to his brethren, to his Christian readers. And precisely these readers, his brethren, he then reminds in 11:30 of their heathenish past, that they had formerly been disobedient to God. One ought to consider further what Weiss brings into prominence: "After the Apostolic Council, Ga 2:7ff., it is to be supposed that Paul would not have written a doctrinal Letter to the Romans, if the congregation in its entirety had been a congregation of περιτομή (circumcised), not of ἀκροβυστία (uncircumcised)." Weissaecker correctly calls attention to the following facts: "That the Neronian persecution did not affect the Jews in Rome, which would have been the case, if the Christians had been regarded as a Jewish party; that the Letter of Clement to the Romans, written some 30 years later, breathes the Gentile spirit completely; "that in the Roman catacombs, in the burial places of the ancient Christians, at every turn one comes upon names, which belonged to eminent families of the city of Rome." Accordingly, one certainly does not err, when one takes for granted that the Gospel of Christ first of all took root among the Jews, but then, especially when the eminent Jews had turned from it, as well as after the arrival of oriental Gentile Christians, it found ready acceptance among the Gentiles, so that the congregation to which Paul wrote his Letter to the Romans was a genuinely Roman congregation, even though a considerable number of Jews were included in it.

The Place and Time of the Writing of the Letter

Both of these facts can be determined exactly. According to Ro 16:1.2 Paul commended to the Roman Christians the deaconess Phoebe of Cenchrea, who evidently was the bearer of this Letter. Cenchrea was

the seaport town of Corinth. In his Letter, 16:23, the Apostle sends a greeting from his host, Gaius. According to 1 Cor 1:14 he was a member of the Corinthian congregation. Therefore without a doubt the Letter was written from Corinth, and from there sent to Rome. The Acts of the Apostles reports a double stay of Paul in Corinth. According to Acts 18:1, on his second missionary journey, he came to Corinth from Athens, there spent a year and six months, and in this city won a great number of people for the Lord. At that time he had begun his work in Greece and had no further plans. On his third missionary journey, according to Acts 20:2.3, he remained in Greece for three months, and certainly for the greater time in the principal city of Greece, where the principal congregation of the land was found, in Corinth. From Greece, as it is further reported in Acts 20, he then returned to Asia, in order to be in Jerusalem, if possible, on Pentecost. At this time the eyes of the Apostle were already turned to Rome as the goal of his journey. Already in Ephesus, according to Acts 19:21, from where he had set out for Macedonia and Greece, he proposed to journey to Jerusalem through Macedonia and Greece, and then also to visit Rome. The time and circumstances agree with what we read in Ro 15:24ff. There Paul attests to the Romans that he considered coming to Rome and then travelling from Rome to Spain, but that first he would deliver to Jerusalem a collection from the Christians in Macedonia and Greece. Accordingly, as is also generally accepted, he wrote this Letter to the Romans during his second stay in Corinth, in the year 58 or 59 A.D.

The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter

A considerable number of commentators hold that the Letter to the Romans, as most of the Pauline Epistles, was occasioned by circumstances and needs of the congregation to which it was addressed and hereby they decide the trend of the Letter. In determining the special occasion and purpose of our Letter, however, the opinions are worlds apart.

Thus they have ascribed to the Letter to the Romans, first of all, an apologetic-polemic tendency, mainly anti-Judaistic. Baur was the first renowned supporter of this view. He sees in the Roman congregation not only an essentially Jewish-Christian, but a congregation Judaizing in thought and direction. In this Letter he sees an attack on the Judaizing practice of the Roman Christians and a defense of the anti-Judaizing, free-from-the-Law standpoint of the Apostle. He takes chap. 9-11 as the real heart of the Letter, to which the first eight chapters serve only as an introduction. The external occasion for chapters 9-11 as for the entire Letter "can be considered nothing else,"--so he writes in his "Paulus," I, 353--"than this which forms the direct contrast" to the idea carried out by the Apostle in this section. Bauer continues

Thus the objection which could still be raised against the participation of the Gentiles in the grace of the Gospel, or against the Pauline universalism in the latter connection, the religious thought so deeply rooted in the knowledge of the Jews and Jewish Christians that, so long as Israel did not share in this grace as a nation, as the people chosen by God, the participation of the Gentiles in it appears as a deprivation of the Jews, as an injustice against them, as a disagreement with the promises given by God to the Jews as the people of God. The principal thought which lies at the base of this explanation, the object about which both sides deal, is the theocratic primacy of the Jewish nation, the absolute preference which they formerly claimed to have over all nations and which they now saw disappearing irrevocably through the Pauline universalism.

The basic idea permeating both principal parts is the absolute futility of all claims which were asserted by Jewish particularism. The purpose of the Apostle is to refute the Jewish particularism so principally and radically, that it lies completely uprooted from the thinking of the times, and these ideas we see carried out in the Letter to the Romans so much more clearly and completely, the closer the connection is in which the two parts relate to one another. P. 380.

The interpretation of Baur has found much agreement and has been adopted with many modifications, for example, by Schweigler, Schenkel, Holtzmann, Reuss, Thiersch, and Mangold. Zahn reduces the anti-Judaism attack by Paul to "prejudices" of the Roman-Jewish Christians against the Gospel of Paul.

The formation and character of the Roman congregation, as Paul was acquainted with it from the reports of his friends from there, made it appear necessary for him to come to an understanding with them by a complete presentation of what the Gospel meant to him, thereby to disperse the prejudices, which were brought against him, and the carrying on of his mission on the part of the Jewish-born Christians and also to prevent future dangers. By virtue of their Jewish origin, their connection with the Church of Palestine, and their place of residence in the center of world commerce, the Roman congregation could just as well become a source of Judaizing mission work, which has followed the Apostle everywhere, as a support for the Christian mission in the west as he meant it to be. (Einleitung in das Neue Testament. P. 308.)

The Judaizing agitators who according to Zahn were making an approach at that time, Weissaecker sees within the Roman congregation, which according to his idea was essentially a Gentile Christian congregation, already in full activity when Paul wrote his Letter. In his work, Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche (1902, p. 424ff.), he expresses himself in the following manner:

The Letter to the Romans is a polemic treatise not only against Judaistic doctrine, but without doubt also against Judaizing activity. The entire doctrinal section of his Letter is full of anti-Judaistic polemics; it is here more complete,

more rounded out than anywhere, even in the Letter to the Galatians. The two facts, that the congregation was Gentile Christian and that of itself it was not Judaistic, on the one hand, and that Paul had to refute Judaism for them, on the other hand, demand the assumption that Judaistic teachers were on the point of taking possession of it and that Paul had received a report of this.

We can never agree with the explanation presented here of the genesis of the Letter to the Romans. The anti-Judaistic tendency of the same, together with its hypothesis, the Judaistic particularism of the Jewish Christians in Rome, or the threat of the Roman congregation from Judaistic teachers, is an invention of the respective commentators; it has no support in the text of the Letter nor in any other of the New Testament writings. The Letter to the Romans is, in distinction from the others which are truly polemical as is quite generally acknowledged, written in serene, measured tones. Other congregations, like those of Galatia and Corinth, it is true, had been threatened by Judaizing teachers or were already confused. These false teachers and apostles, however, are also named and characterized in the Letter to the Galatians and in the Second Letter to the Corinthians. In our Letter there is found no reference to such opponents of the Apostle and his apostolic activity. And it is not Paul's way to attack his opponents indirectly or, as it were, underhandedly. The warning against false teachers in Ro 16:17-20, is kept so general that it applies to the Christians of all places and of all times. And this warning added to the close of the Letter certainly does not give the character to the entire Letter. We discover in the Letter no trace which points to Jewish Christians in Rome opposing the Gospel which Paul proclaimed and which was acknowledged by their Gentile fellow-Christians, nor that they were still caught up in Jewish ideas.

If in his Epistle to the Romans Paul had intended a refutation of the above mentioned prejudices and objections of the Jewish-born Christians, then, as for example Godet correctly calls our attention, the method of Paul, e.g., the long doctrinal discussions, would not relate to that purpose. Certainly in his Letter Paul often permits a contrary meaning to be expressed, mostly in the form of a question. Still "the dialectic method by which Paul carries on his discussion, as in 6:1,15; 7:7, and completely in 9:14,19; 10:14; 11:1,14, that it is but natural to see in them objections of the opponents whom he is attacking." Weiss. Certainly at Paul's time and also in Rome there had been people who reproached the Christian doctrine, especially the doctrine of the free grace of God, and that this led to or gave occasion for sin (Cf. 3,8; 6,1). But those were usually opponents of Christianity, as even today we hear similar evil slanders from the mouths of unbelievers. Certainly in his Letter to the Romans where he presented the Gospel the Apostle stood completely in opposition to the opposing errors. He everywhere added to his thesis, principal of which was that man is justified by faith, the antithesis of the unbelieving Jews which he excluded: not by work, not by the works of the Law. Meyer's remarks apply here:

Naturally Paul could not present his Gospel in any other way than in opposition to the Jewish work-righteousness and arrogance, which the Gospel had and would overcome continually; this opposition struck at its essence and it kept opposing the Gospel everywhere where Judaism was. So also at Rome.

Wherever the Christian truth is heard, there opposition and error also raise themselves. Therefore confession of the truth is impossible without the exclusion of error. So it belongs to the essence of Christian teaching and the presentation of doctrine, that the truth lays bare and

refutes the opposing errors. The principal article of Christian doctrine, justification by faith and the righteousness that avails before God, can be presented and clarified in no other way than in contrast to the Jewish-Pharisaical self-righteousness and work-righteousness. Thus already the Prophets of the Old Covenant, when they reminded their people of the great favors of God or prophesied to them of the future grace, continually impressed upon them the fact that God was gracious to them for His own sake, not for their sakes, not for the sake of their works. Christ, when He entered upon His teaching activity, found a Judaism made corrupt by the proud Pharisees and scribes. When He attested Himself as the promised Redeemer, as the Savior of sinners, He had to put to shame the self-confidence of the Jews. In a similar situation the Apostles of Jesus Christ found themselves. Yes, even today Christian preachers find themselves in this opposition. The Pharisaic-Judaistic doctrine of works is not only the Shibboleth of present-day Judaism, but has also taken root in the Roman Church and in other sects, yes, is basically the morality and religion of the entire unbelieving world, of natural, unconverted mankind. The attack of anti-evangelical errors, which is necessarily combined with the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ, is, however, an entirely different matter from what these commentators understand under anti-Judaistic polemics. Only the former, not the latter, is a characteristic of the Letter to the Romans.

While to some the Letter to the Romans appears as a controversial writing, other commentators have received from it the opposite impression, namely, that it pursues an irenic, conciliatory tendency. Hilgenfeld thinks that through the inner friction of both parts, of the Jewish

Christian and Gentile Christian sections, this Letter had been occasioned. Paul "would reconcile the patrician consciousness of Jewish Christianity with the surprising spread and strengthening of the common people of Gentile Christianity, in that he sought to completely remove the aversion of the Jewish Christian against the Law-free Gospel" (Einleitung. P. 310). Volkmar and Holsten judge similarly. In his book, Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften und Lehren" (1902, I, p. 149ff.; 309ff.), Pfleiderer follows the idea that the Apostle in his Letter seeks to win to his Gospel the Jewish minority, which felt itself pressed and infringed upon, and to reconcile them with Gentile Christianity, which was gaining ground victoriously. On the other hand, he wanted to procure for the Gentile Christians a deeper insight into the moral essence of Christianity. Therefore in this document he appeased the scruples of the Roman Jewish Christians against his doctrine of justification by faith and freedom from the Law and clarified for them the fact of the Gentile Christianity's becoming superior as a divine dispensation, which did not stand in opposition to the divine promise to Israel. Otto gives us the most exact information regarding how it stood with the Christians in Rome at the time of the composition of the Letter. He reports, as if he had read these things in the Roman annals, that at that time two separate Christian congregations existed in Rome, the Gentile Christian, the original congregation, and a smaller congregation made up of Christians who had immigrated from Palestine, whose leader was Aquila, and that the former showed no willingness to receive the latter into their midst. Through the conflict between these two congregations, he thinks, Paul was moved to direct this document to the original Roman congregation (Gentile),

in which he carried out the purpose of opposing the consequences which the separate congregation from Palestine could have for the original congregation. Thus Paul removed the separation existing between them.

That the last-sketched construction of the Letter to the Romans is a vision is apparent. But what concerns the entire theory of the conciliatory tendency of the Letter, as we have already remarked above, is that the contrast between the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in Rome belongs to the field of fiction. Therefore there was no need for attempted reconciliation on the part of the Apostle. One can exact such a conflict from the text of his Letter only with force. According to the Letter to the Romans the Roman congregation appears as a unified congregation, which was one in faith, which indeed still showed many defects, for example, also in the point of brotherly love. The contrast which actually goes through the entire Letter is the contrast between the believing Jews and Gentiles on the one hand and the unbelieving Jewish people on the other hand, between justification by faith and justification by the Law and that is an irreconcilable contrast which Paul in no way seeks to equalize. The many references to the Old Testament promises in our Letter explain themselves sufficiently from the essence of the apostolic teachings, without taking into consideration the forced hypothesis. In this manner Paul had wanted to win the Roman Jewish Christians for his Gospel. The apostolic doctrine, the Gospel of Paul, was and is no new doctrine and religion, but the original truth which had already been attested by Moses and the Prophets. The Gospel shows and is the fulfillment of the Old Testament promise. The Old Testament has value and is an authority for the Church of all times. Therefore

the Apostles, after the example of Christ, based their teaching and preaching completely on the Old Testament Scriptures, no matter whether they dealt with Jews or with Gentiles. The Gentile Christians also were acquainted with the writings of the Prophets. The Church of Christ, likewise also the Gentile Church, is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. A unique example is the explanation of Spitta concerning the genesis of our Letter. In his work, Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums (III, I Volume: Untersuchungen ueber den Brief des Paulus an die Roemer 1901), Spitta (as does Otto) splits the Letter to the Romans into two parts. About the time of the Apostolic Council Paul had written up a justification of his Gentile mission work. He had presented this written document to the August Council in Jerusalem. The Jewish Christians looked at the preaching of the free grace and the surprising growth of the Gentile Church with doubt and suspicion, and Paul sought to address these scruples. According to Spitta this portion of the writing is contained in Ro 1:16b-11:10. Here Jewish Christian readers are presumed everywhere with the exception of a few passages; the framework, however, which surrounds these expressions, 1:1-15; 11:11-36; 15:14-33, designates the readers expressly as Gentile Christians. Into this framework Paul had later enclosed this Letter, in order to send it in this form to the expressly Gentile Christian congregation in Rome and in this manner to make it suitable for the Gentile circle of readers. That then had been the first letter of Paul to the Romans, after which, about the year 63 or 64, a second followed, from which Ro 12:1-15:7; 16:1-20 were preserved. Finally some unknown person worked the two portions of the letters into one letter. For Spitta his

understanding of chap. 9-11 is of deciding significance. Here he differentiates between 9:1-11:10 and 11:11-36. Between both sections there exists such a deep contrast that it is for him psychologically impossible that the author of 11:11ff. should have written 9:1-11:10 at the same time. For from 11:11 on the thought is presented that finally all Israel shall be saved, while according to 9:1-11:10 only a part of Israel is elected; Israel as a whole, however, $\delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (11:10) remains obdurate. Thus in the time from the Apostolic Council to the writing of the first letter to the Romans there had entered into Paul a change in his perception of the destiny of Israel and in his state of mind over against his people. That the two statements concerning Israel in chap. 9-11 do not contradict one another will be shown in the exposition. Moreover, the historical data, with which Spitta operates, as for example the letter of Paul to the Jewish Christians from the time of the Apostolic Council, is taken altogether out of the air. And an authorship of that sort, as is here ascribed to the Apostle Paul, who with his altered meaning should still at the same time have asserted the former, contrary meaning would not only be a peculiarity but a monstrosity. Still the modern critics in their literary profession have accustomed themselves to such monstrosities. The best critique of the modern mock critics is contained in Carl Hesedamm's book: Der Roemerbrief beurtheilt und geviertheilt. (1891. Cp. "Lehre und Wehre," 1892, p. 87ff.)

The most recent literary product, which is dedicated to "the problem of the Letter to the Romans" and from which we have partially taken the quoted material on the history of literature, is Feine's book, Der Roemerbrief, eine exegetische Studie (1903). Feine turns the tables

and maintains that the explanations in this Letter do not aim, as the previously named expositors believe, at the overcoming, refuting, or winning of the Jewish Christians, but much rather at the instruction of the Gentile Christians. He, like Baur and Spitta, finds the basic motive of the Apostle expressed most clearly in chap. 9-11, except that in these chapters the opposite to that which the former have found therein comes out so clearly. He writes:

Accordingly the basic thought of the Apostle is this: God's way with the Gospel shows that this salvation is intended for the whole world. Israel alone is and remains the holy nation. Their blessings are the one in which the rest of mankind receives a share. Therefore the Roman Gentile Christians have no reason to look down disdainfully upon the Jewish nation, even though the majority of them have remained unbelieving. The Gentile Christians should thankfully praise the way of God, which had ordained unbelief over Israel so long, until the fulness of the Gentiles had been won for the Christian faith. But Paul spoke of this as the Apostle to the Gentiles, borne by his conviction of the truth of his Law-free evangelical proclamation. He acknowledges thus the Christianity of the Romans, which also would know nothing regarding a tie to the Jewish Law, is complete and is fully qualified. With this we have the key to the understanding of the Letter to the Romans: The Letter shows that salvation is completely universal, that only the preaching of the Gospel is justified, which overcomes the limitations of Jewish particularism and places the redemptive death of Christ as the only foundation of salvation, notwithstanding that the Gospel is the fulfillment of the Old Testament promise, which had been presented to the nation of Israel. This people (Israel) possessed an inalienable privilege and superiority, which the Gentile Christians could not fail to recognize. (P. 82).

Therefore Feine gives the chapter which presents the one solution to the problem the following superscription: "Der Roemerbrief als Darstellung des heidenchristlichen und doch juden-[christlichen] Evangelium des Paulus fuer die das unglaeubige Israel hochmuetig beurtheilenden heidenchristlichen Roemer." (P. 80--The Letter to the Romans as St. Paul's presentation of the Gospel for the Gentile Christians yet friendly to the Jews, to the

Romans disdainfully judging the unbelieving Israel.") Yes, in this manner one can easily carry every outrageous motive through the Letter. The solution of Feine, which in a completely indiscrete manner makes the special warning to the Gentile Christians in 11:16ff. into the theme of the entire Letter, will show itself also as an "Eintagsfliege" (ephemeral or momentary), and, like the interpretation of Baur as an historical document, it shall be placed ad acta.

Now if there are not special conditions and circumstances in the Roman congregation with which the Letter to the Romans deals, whose formation, content, and purpose finds a sufficient explanation, then perhaps the personal circumstances and needs of Paul could have occasioned the Letter and have moved the Apostle to write exactly as he had written. That is the opinion of Hofmann and the exegetes dependent on him. Hofmann here ascribes to the Apostle the intention to refute the appearance aroused by the Apostle's former avoidance of Rome, as if he bore an aversion to proclaiming the Christian message of salvation in the world capitol, the center of heathen education and culture. How? The complete presentation of doctrine contained in the Letter is supposed to be only a means to this end? No, the personal remarks of Paul at the beginning and close of the Letter are evidently only the framework of the instruction which makes up the real content of the Letter. Hofmann finally makes the following concession: "The congregation in which the Apostle appeared not to teach originally, but to which he only wanted to express his boundless joy for the preaching of the doctrine of Christ, had really been imperceptibly taught so richly by him. They willingly permitted Paul to address them just as he did." But how? Did the rich instruction,

which the Roman congregation received from him in this Letter, flow from the pen of the Apostle "imperceptibly," or by chance? Schott is of the opinion that Paul's activity up to the writing of the Letter to the Romans had been principally Jewish mission work, but now, since he was on the point of beginning his mission work among the Gentiles in the far west, he had wanted to win a firm fulcrum in the Roman congregation for this new activity. Therefore in this Epistle he wanted to instruct the Romans concerning the significance and right of his action and completely show forth to them the nature and the principles of his work. But everything that we read in the Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of Paul concerning his activity contradicts this view, as if Paul had worked among the Jews only in the Orient and had begun his real mission work among the Gentiles first with his removal to the west. And the entire situation and content of the Letter to the Romans contradicts our taking this Letter as a personal justification for the activity of Paul. And so the tendency which Luthardt ascribes to the Apostle, is forced upon our Letter as though the presentation of the universal meaning of Christianity would move the Romans to support his apostolic mission.

The commentators previously mentioned cannot free themselves from the thought that an entirely special occasion and tendency must be the basis of the Letter to the Romans as also of the other Pauline Epistles. Because that occasion is difficult to discover they speak of a problem of the Letter to the Romans and they seek to solve it in every possible way. Feine, who after the many vain attempts of his predecessors, thinks he has found one correct solution to the puzzle,

remarks at the same time very naively but very correctly, that "the Letter to the Romans has always again and again given the impression that in a certain sense it is a total presentation of the Pauline Gospel" (op. cit., p. 28). Now, why do they not give credence to this impression? Why do they not renounce the discovery of always new hypothesis, which move about an "X," which they shall never decipher, because it does not exist? All "such special designations of purpose," as Meyer correctly remarks, "are missing from the Letter in concrete detail." Yes, it is true, the Letter has always and at all times given the impression to commentators that Paul gave and self-evidently also aimed at a complete presentation of his doctrine. "The old Greek commentators, Origen, Chrysostum, and Theodoret, those of the Middle Ages, as John of Damascus, Oecumenius, Theophylact, seek in our Letter no more mysterious purpose other than this: To lead men to Christ" (Godet). In the old Protestant Church the Letter to the Romans was regarded completely as a sort of Compendium doctrinae Christianae, as the "Loci" of Melancthon, the first evangelical dogmatics, have grown out of it. And most of the modern exegetes agree with that. Olshausen writes: "One can therefore say that in the Letter to the Romans there is contained at the same time a Pauline dogmatics, in that all the instances which the Apostle Paul was accustomed to call attention to in preference in his handling of the Gospel, are here completely developed." Godet: "We possess in this Letter nothing less than the course of religious instruction, as it were, the dogmatic and moral catechism of the Apostle." Tholuck, Rueckert, de Wette, Fritzsche, Meyer, Weiss, Philippi and others, offer a similar opinion.

The didactic purpose of the Letter appears clearly enough in the Letter itself, as also the motive for the instruction which lay in nothing else than in the office of Paul as the teacher and Apostle of the Gentiles. The Apostle had often intended to come to Rome, in order to strengthen the Roman congregation, to impart to them some spiritual gift, but had until now been hindered in that purpose (Ro 1:11.13). When he wrote this Letter, he had resolved to travel through Rome to Spain, after first he had gone to Jerusalem to minister to the saints (Ro 15:24.25.27; Acts 19:21). On the way to Jerusalem and in Jerusalem a new hindrance could easily step into the way of his projected Roman journey. Thus his oral communication with the Roman Christians was still in the undetermined future. But in Corinth Paul found a welcome opportunity to send a letter to the Romans in that the deaconess Phoebe was on the point of going to Rome. Under these circumstances it was natural, even self-evident, that the Apostle seized this opportunity to write to the Roman congregation. This congregation was predominantly Gentile. They had begun without Paul's assistance and had grown rapidly. He imparted to them by letter what he had spoken orally to the other congregations among the Gentiles since he could not in the near future speak or deal with them person to person. He was a debtor to the Greeks as well as to the barbarians (1:14). He had received the special commission from the Lord to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, to establish the obedience of faith among the Gentiles (1:5; 15:16). Yes, because of this special Gentile apostleship, "because of this special grace which had been granted him" (διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), he had, as he himself testifies in 15:15, written this letter to the Romans "in order to remind"

them (ὡς ἐπαγαμνησάβν ὑμᾶς) of that which they had already heard and learned from others, i.e., the Christian doctrine, to present and to establish this doctrine among them completely. In this Epistle he would evidently give to the Romans a substitute for his oral teaching and preaching, which they had formerly not had and would not have for a long time to come. One must add the following facts to which Godet also calls attention. Before Paul came to Corinth he had been active at Ephesus for a long time. For two years he had instructed the Christians regularly in the school of the orator Tyrannus, and had held a series of lectures (Acts 19:9.10). He had proclaimed to the Ephesians the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:27). Then he had travelled through Macedonia and there admonished the disciples with "many words" (λόγῳ πολλῷ). Now he did the same also in Greece, especially in Corinth (Acts 20:1-3). The official activity of Paul during his third missionary journey consisted primarily in exhaustive instruction and admonition of the disciples, whom he had won for the Lord on his second missionary journey. How very likely it was therefore that he would convey to the principal Christian congregations in the world capitol, which was much spoken of, a written instruction, which contained the entire counsel of God concerning our salvation, since he could not first instruct them orally. Certainly the origin and tendency of the Letter to the Romans is transparent enough when one rightly takes into consideration the notices contained in the Letter itself and in the Acts of the Apostles. One does not need to invent anything in addition, as Weiss supposes, not even that the Apostle, at the important turning point at which he had now arrived when he would transfer his Gentile missionary activity from the Orient to the west,

felt in himself the need of recollecting the spiritual products of his last years and to establish them by means of a literary presentation. Nor did he send this document to the Roman congregation because his clear vision recognized the fact that the church in the world capitol must become the center of the great Gentile Church.

In all this one fact must not be forgotten, namely that Paul had received his doctrine, his Gospel, from the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor 15:3), and that the Holy Spirit had taught Paul and his fellow Apostles the heavenly wisdom which they spoke both orally and in writing and also taught them the words with which they expounded the wisdom of God (1 Cor 2;7.12.13). The Spirit of God who spoke through Paul in the Letter under consideration and gave him the impulse to write, hereby had further intentions, namely that in this Epistle, which Luther correctly names as the principal article of the New Testament, He would place into the hands of the Church of God of all ages a firm and certain form of the saving doctrine (τύπος διδασχῆς, 6:17), which should form the basis of all Christian instruction, also of the learned instruction, which satisfies the needs of salvation in all ages, and which repels the most corrupt errors of all ages.

Finally, if the objection is raised that in this "doctrinal system" of the Apostle the essential, chief articles of the Christian doctrine are not alluded to, for example, Christology and eschatology, then a fleeting glance at the content of the Letter shows the opposite. Certainly the way of salvation ordained by God is presented here above all. But neither does it lack in the basic teaching of the Person of the Savior. The statement of Ro 9:5 is one of the most eminent sedes

doctrinae (seats of doctrine) of the article of the true divinity of Christ. In the presentation of the work of redemption Christ is designated expressly as the Son of God. In the introduction of the Letter there are found all the stamina (threads) of biblical Christology. Likewise in the Letter there is a repeated pointing to the end of the way of salvation, to the day of judgment, to the deliverance from the impending wrath, to the resurrection of the dead, to the future glory and the life eternal.

Content and Disposition of the Letter

In the foregoing section regarding the occasion and tendency of the Letter, we naturally had to reflect on its content. The Letter to the Romans, as we have attested and as every impartial reader soon becomes aware, is a comprehensive, systematic presentation of the doctrine of Paul, of the Christian doctrine, which also has no other purpose than to instruct the readers of the Letter in order to advance and to establish them in the knowledge of the divine truth. Here we give only a short review of the doctrinal content of the Letter. A deeper insight into the structure of the content, into the train of thought of the Apostle one can give only then, when one takes up the Letter itself and gives a commentary on it. After the introductory remarks in 1:1-15 the Apostle announces the theme, 1:16.17, which he then develops in five parts. In one word the theme is the righteousness revealed in the Gospel, the righteousness which avails before God and leads to salvation, the righteousness of faith. Knowledge of righteousness presupposes a knowledge of sin. And so in the first section, 1:18-3:20, the Apostle first of all shows that all men, Gentiles and Jews, are under sin, are guilty and punishable before God. Then in the second part, 3:21-5:21,

he describes that righteousness more clearly and shows that man is justified before God without the works of the Law, by grace alone, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, thru faith in Christ. The third part, chapters 6-8, treats of sanctification, the walking in the Spirit, as the necessary effect of the justification by faith. The fourth part, chap. 9-11, is historical in character. Paul points to the wonderful ways in which God leads Israel and the Gentiles, and which lead to the conclusion that not only the fulness of the Gentiles but also the full number of Israel shall actually become partakers of the salvation in Christ. The fifth part, chap. 12-16, continues to give (for Christians) who are motivated by the mercy of God, special admonitions. There the individual characteristics of the Christian life and conduct are set forth.

We supplement this designation of content with a few statements from the Preface of Koerner's Commentarius in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos scriptam: *Nihil certe omnino ratio et mens hominis de illis habet cognita, quae sola Dei gratia et benigna revelatione nobis communicari solent. Quaeenam illa? Quomodo nimirum a peccatorum mole et damnatione liberemur, iusti reputemur a Deo, et restituamur pristinae integritati et sanctitati, in qua primos parentes conditos esse et ex illa postea excidisse secumque totum humanum genus et omnem suam posteritatem in tristissimam ruinam exitiumque traxisse nemini non ex ecclesiae doctrina constat. Haec autem a nullo sacro scriptore rectius, plenius majoreque cum spiritu et fructu perscripta et ecclesiae sunt tradita relictaque, quam a D. Paulo, cum in plurimis eius epistolis aliis, tum vero in hac potissimum, quam ad Romanos doctos homines et ad*

christianam fidem conversos ipse vivus scripsit atque misit. . . . In hac nostra (epistola) hoc agit potissimum et ex professo, ut locum de gratuita per fidem justificatione hominis peccatoris fideli studio perspicue et plene doceat et illi vicinos locos de peccato, de gratia, de lege conjungat, nosque in nostri et miseriae nostrae cognitionem ducat et Dei Patris admirandam bonitatem et misericordiam in nobis propter Christum justificandis mirifice commendet. Quid enim docet aliud, quam omnes homines esse peccatores et sola fide aut gratis, Dei misericordia propter Christi satisfactionem et obedientiam justificari, et justificados debere pietati et sanctitati studere? Ob quarum rerum praestantem dignitatem, licet illa post quasdam alias esset scripta: primus tamen ei locus iudicio ecclesiae inter omnes epistolas Pauli datus et concessus fuit, ut vel hoc quoque nomine esset nobis commendabilior et gratior. Set abhibuit quoque rerum sententiarumque miram gravitatem et verborum lucem tamque pulchrum et expeditum ordinem cum praecipuorum membrorum, tum etiam minorum partium, ut diligenter et accurate eam legentem non possit non valde afficere ipsique jucunda et perspicua videri.

Finally, we add the beginning and the conclusion, as well as short summaries of all chapters from Luther's classical Preface to the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, St. Louis Ed., XIV, p. 94ff.

"This Epistle is the real chief article of the New Testament, and the most undefiled Gospel, which is really worthy and worthwhile, that a Christian should not only commit it to memory word for word, but associate with it daily, as with daily bread for the soul. For it can never be read or studied too much or too well. The more it is dealt with, the more precious and the more enjoyable it becomes.

"Because it is given to an evangelical preacher, first of all, to castigate through the revelation of the Law and of sin and to make sinful what is not motivated by the Spirit and faith in Christ, whereby men shall be led to their own knowledge and misery so that they become humble and desire help, so did St. Paul. He begins in the very first chapter and criticizes the gross sins and the unbelief which were manifest, as the sins of the heathen who live without God were and still are, and says: 'For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.' For although they both know and daily recognize that there is a God, still the nature in them, outside of grace, is so evil that it neither gives thanks to Him nor honors Him, but blinds itself and continually falls into worse conduct, until it idolatrously works the most shameful sins with all blasphemies, nor does it find fault with those that commit them.

"In the second chapter he extends such punishment further upon those who outwardly appear so devout, or who sin, secretly, as the Jews did and as all hypocrites still do, who live well and honorably outwardly but in the heart are hostile to God's Law. These still gladly judge other people, as is the manner of all hypocrites, because they consider themselves pure, but they still are full of avarice, hatred, and pride, and they hide their filthiness (Mt 23:25). Such despise the goodness of God and according to their hardness heap wrath upon themselves. St. Paul, a genuine expounder of the Law, permits no one to remain without sin, but he proclaims the wrath of God to all, also those who by nature or free will would live well, and he permits them to be nothing better than manifest sinners; yes, he says, they are hard-spirited and unrepentant.

"In the third chapter he casts them all into one heap and says: One is as the others, all are sinners before God, except that the Jews had God's Word. Although many did not believe that Word, still God's grace and mercy are not thereby at an end. And he casually inserts the statement from Psalm 51:6, that God remains righteous in His words. After that he comes to this point and proves also by the Scripture that they are all sinners, and through the work of the Law no one is justified. The Law had been given only to give a knowledge of sin. Thereafter he begins to teach the correct way, how one must become devout and blessed, and says: 'All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace' through faith in Christ, who has merited such things for us through His blood, and has become a throne of grace for us before God, who forgives us all former sins. Thereby He proves that His righteousness alone, which He gives through faith, helps us. At the same time His righteousness is manifest through the Gospel, and has formerly been testified through the Law and the Prophets. Thus the Law is established through faith, although the works of the Law and nullified together with their glory.

"When now through the first three chapters sin is revealed and the way of faith to righteousness is taught, in the fourth chapter he begins to encounter several objections and claims. He takes up the first one which deals with those who hear of faith and how man is justified without works, and say: Should one then do no good works? Thus he holds Abraham up before himself and says: What has Abraham then accomplished with his works? Has it all been in vain? Were his works unnecessary? And he concludes that Abraham was justified without any works, but alone

through faith, so that even before the work of his circumcision he is praised in the Scriptures as justified only because of his faith (Gn 15:6). But had the work of circumcision which God had demanded done nothing for his righteousness? If his good work of obedience accomplished nothing, then certainly no other good work can do anything for righteousness. But as the circumcision of Abraham was an outward sign whereby he proved his righteousness in faith, so all good works are only signs which follow out of faith and prove it as good fruits, to show that man is already inwardly righteous before God. With that powerful example from the Scriptures, St. Paul now corroborates his former teaching in the third chapter, v.27, concerning faith, and he adds to that still another witness, David, from Psalm 32, who also states that man is justified without works. David too states that man does not remain without works when he has become justified. Afterwards he broadens the example against all other works of the Law, and he concludes that the Jews are heirs of Abraham because of blood, much less because of the works of the Law, but they must inherit Abraham's faith, if they would be real heirs. Abraham had been justified by faith before the Law of Moses or of circumcision came, and he had been called the father of all believers. Besides the Law much rather works wrath than grace, since no one keeps it with desire and love. Hence, disfavor comes through the work of the Law rather than favor. Therefore only faith can receive the grace promised to Abraham. Such examples are also written for our sake, that we also should believe.

"In the fifth chapter he comes to the fruits and works of faith. These are: peace, joy, love for God and everyone, together with certainty, confidence, joyousness, courage, and hope in tribulation and suffering.

These fruits follow where faith really is present because of the boundless goodness which God has shown to us in Christ, in that He permitted Him to die for us before we could ask Him, yes, when we were still enemies. Thus it is that faith without any works justifies. And still it does not follow from that that one should therefore do no good works, but that the righteous works should not fail. The work-righteous know nothing of this and they invent for themselves their own works, in which there is neither peace, joy, certainty, love, hope, confidence, nor any form of real Christian work and faith. Thereafter he breaks out in pleasing bawling and diversion and he relates from whence come both sin and unrighteousness, death and life. He sets the two neatly against each other, Adam and Christ. Thus he would say: Therefore Christ must come, a second Adam, who offers His righteousness to us through a new spiritual birth in faith, just as that Adam brought sin upon us through the old fleshly birth. Thereby it is made manifest and confirmed that no one can help himself out of sin to righteousness with works, as little as he can prevent his being born bodily. Also thereby he proves that the divine Law, which still rightly should help, should help somewhat to righteousness, not only has become helpless, but has also increased sin, in that the evil nature becomes the more hostile to it, and the more the Law hinders it, the more its desire would satisfy itself. Thus the Law makes Christ the more necessary, and demands more grace, which should help nature.

"In the sixth chapter he proposes the special work of faith, the battle of the spirit with the flesh, to put to death completely the remaining sins and lusts which remain after justification, and he teaches us that we are thus not freed from sin through faith, that we

should not be idle, lazy, and secure as if there were no more sin. Sin is there, but it is not to be reckoned for condemnation because of the faith which strives against it. Therefore we have enough to do throughout our whole life to restrain our body, to put to death its lusts and overcome its members, so that they are obedient to the Spirit and not to the lusts. Thus we are like the death and resurrection of Christ and we fulfill our Baptism (which also signifies the death of sins and a new life of grace), until we are completely clean of sin and are raised bodily with Christ and live eternally. That we can do, he says, because we are under grace and not under the Law. What he explains as being without Law does not say that one has no Law and might do what one desires. And to be under the Law is to go about with the works of the Law without grace. Then sin certainly reigns through the Law, since no one is by nature friendly to the Law; that in itself is a great sin. Grace, however, makes the Law pleasing to us; then there is no more sin there, and the Law is no more against us, but is one with us. That is the real freedom from sin and from the Law of which he writes at the end of this chapter; it is a freedom only to do good with joy and to live well without the compulsion of the Law. Therefore the freedom is a spiritual freedom, which does not annul the Law, but presents what is demanded by the Law, namely, joy and love, whereby the Law is stilled and no longer drives nor demands. Just as if you were in debt to a feudal lord and could not pay. From that you would like to become free in a twofold manner: first, that he takes nothing from you and tears up his record; the other, that a devout man pays for you and gives to you, so that you could satisfy the debt. In this manner Christ has made us free from the

Law. Therefore it is not a wild, fleshly freedom which should do nothing, but it does many and all sorts of things and is unencumbered by the demands and built of the Law.

"In the seventh chapter he confirms such things with a comparison of married life. When a husband dies, then the wife is also free. The one is thus free and released from the other. Now the wife may or may not take another husband. This is a freedom which she previously did not have before she was free from her husband. Thus our conscience is bound under the Law, under the sinful old man; when the old man is put to death through the Spirit, then the conscience is free, and the one is released from the other. Not that the conscience should do nothing, but now first it can really cling to Christ, the other man, and bring forth the fruit of life. Thereafter he develops more fully the nature of sin and of the Law, how through the Law sin now really reigns and becomes powerful. For the old man only becomes more hostile to the Law, because he cannot pay what is demanded by the Law. For his nature is sinful and he can do nothing else of himself; therefore the Law is his death and all his torment. Not that the Law is evil, but that the evil nature cannot endure the good, that it demands good from him, just as a sick person cannot endure that one demands of him running and jumping and other works of a well person. Therefore St. Paul concludes here that where the Law is really known and comprehended best there it does no more than to remind us of our sins and put us to death through the same, and make us guilty of eternal wrath, as one experiences in his conscience when it is really concerned with the Law. One must have something different and more than the Law to make him devout and to save him. But those who do not really

know the Law are blind, go about with boldness, and think they do enough for it with works. They do not know how much the Law demands, namely, a spontaneous, happy heart. Therefore they do not see Moses correctly, the veil has been laid over and has hidden him. After that he shows how Spirit and flesh strive against one another and he sets himself up as an example so that we learn correctly to know the work (of putting to death the sin within ourselves). But he calls both the Spirit and the flesh a law, therefore, that just as it is a way of the divine Law to drive and demand, so the flesh drives and demands and rages against the Spirit and would have its desires. Again the Spirit drives and makes demands against the flesh and wants to have its desires. This contention endures within us as long as we live, in one more, in another less, accordingly as the Spirit or the flesh becomes stronger. And still the whole man is himself both spirit and flesh, striving within him until he becomes completely spirit.

"In the eighth chapter he comforts such contenders, so that they do not condemn the flesh. He shows further what the nature of flesh and spirit is and how the spirit comes from Christ, who has given us His Holy Spirit to make us spiritual and to suppress the flesh. He assures us that we are nevertheless children of God, however hard sin rages within us, so long as we follow the Spirit and strive against sin to put it to death. But because nothing is so effective to deafen the flesh as cross and suffering, he comforts us in suffering through the support of the Spirit of love and of the entire creation. The Spirit groans within us and even the creatures yearn with us that we be set free from the flesh and sin. Thus we see that these three chapters, 6-8, set in motion

the one work of faith, which drives us to put to death the old Adam and to overcome the flesh.

"In the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters he teaches of the eternal providence (Versehung) of God; whence it flows originally, who should believe and not believe, who can be free of sins or not be free; by which it is taken completely out of our hands and placed into the hand of God, that we become upright. And that is necessary in the highest degree. For we are so weak and uncertain, that, if it were up to us, then not one man would be saved; the devil would certainly overcome all of us. But now God is certain that His Providence cannot fail Him, nor can anyone prevent Him; we still have hope against sin. But here for once the outrageous and arrogant spirits must be put in their place because they put their reason first before they search the abyss of divine Providence and thereby trouble themselves in vain, whether they are predestined. They must bring their own downfall so that they either lose courage or cast themselves upon chance. But you should follow this Epistle in its order, concern yourself about Christ and the Gospel, so that you know your sin and His grace, and thereafter strive against sin, as has been taught in chap. 1-8. Thereafter, when you have come to the 8th chapter, under cross and suffering, that will teach you correctly how comforting is the Providence told in chapters 10 and 11. For without suffering, cross, and perils of death one cannot treat of His Providence without injure nor of the secret wrath against God. Therefore Adam must first be really dead before he suffers this thing and drinks the strong wine. Therefore take care that you do not drink wine when you are still an infant. Every doctrine has its measure, time, and age.

"In the twelfth chapter he teaches the correct worship and makes all Christians into priests that they offer sacrifice; not gold or cattle, as in the Law, but their own bodies, with the mortification of the flesh. Thereafter he describes the outward conduct of the Christians in the spiritual realm, how they should teach, preach, rule, serve, give, suffer, love, live, and act over against friend, foe, and everyone. These are the works which a Christian does. For, as has been said, Faith never takes a holiday.

"In the thirteenth chapter he teaches us to honor and to be obedient to the civil realm, which is ordained for that purpose; altho it really does not make the people devout before God, still it does so much, that the devout have outward peace and protection, and the evil ones cannot do their evil freely without fear or with peace (of mind) and quiteness. Therefore it is to be honored, also by the pious, even though they may not need it. Finally, however, he includes all things in love and concludes it in the example of Christ, as He has done for us, that we also do thus and follow after Him.

"In the fourteenth chapter he teaches to gently lead the weak consciences in faith and to take care of them, so that one does not use the freedom of the Christians to injury but to the furtherance of the weak. For where one does not do that, there follows discord and a despising of the Gospel, upon which all have need. It is better to give way a little to the weak, until they become stronger, than that the teaching of the Gospel should be lost. Such a work is a special work of love, greatly needed now also, when there are those who needlessly shake the weak consciences with their eating of flesh and insolent and rough use of freedom before the truth is understood.

"In the fifteenth chapter he sets up Christ as an example, that we should also endure the other weak ones, when they are unstable, living in manifest sins or have disagreeable habits. One must not cast them away but bear with them until they become better. For thus has Christ done to us and still does daily, so that He bears very many vices and evil habits, together with every defect in us, and helps unceasingly. Thereafter, at the close, he prays for them, praises them and commits them to God, and he declares his office and preaching, and very nicely requests of them aid for the poor at Jerusalem. It is real love of which he speaks and with which he walks.

"The last chapter is a chapter of greetings, but therein he inserts a very noble warning against doctrines of men, which make inroads into the evangelical teaching and cause dissension, just as though he had certainly seen that out of Rome and by the Romans there should come the corrupting, scandalous canons and decretals and the entire canker and vermin of human laws and commandments, which now drown the whole world and have destroyed this Epistle and all Holy Scripture, together with the Spirit and faith, so that nothing more remains there than the idol's belly, whose servants St. Paul calls them here. God preserve us from them. Amen.

"Thus in the richest manner we find in this Epistle what a Christian should know, namely, what is Law, Gospel, sin, punishment, grace, faith, righteousness, Christ, God, good works, love, hope (and cross), and how we should conduct ourselves over against everyone, be he a devout one or sinner, strong or weak, friend or foe, and over against ourselves. To that end have all things been excellently

established with writings, proven with examples of himself and of the Prophets, so that nothing more is to be desired. Therefore it also appears as if St. Paul in this Epistle wanted to draw up the entire Christian and evangelical doctrine in a short statement and prepare an introduction into the entire Old Testament. For without doubt, whoever has this Epistle well in his heart has the light and power of the Old Testament in him. Therefore let every Christian be exercised in it generally and constantly. For that may God give us grace. Amen."

Literature

The Letter to the Romans has experienced numerous treatments. We mention here only the better known and more significant ones. A complete list of the pertinent larger and smaller writings would be hard to provide. From the ancient church we have expositions of the Letter by Origen, Chrysostum, Theodoret, and the so-called Ambrosiaster, and then of Oecumenius from the 10th century and of Theophylact from the 11th century. The best known old Lutheran expositors of the Letter to the Romans are: Melanchthon, Annotationes 1522; Commentarius 1532; Bugenhagen, Annotationes 1523; Brenz, Commentarius 1563; Flacius in his Glossa 1570; Koerner, Commentarius 1583; Hunnius, Expositio 1587; Balduin, Commentarius 1611; Calov in his Biblia Illustrata; Bengel, Gnomen. Of the Reformed exegetes we mention: Calvin, Beza, Bucher, Coccejus, Grotius. The most noteworthy recent commentators of the Letter to the Romans are: Tholuck 1825; Rueckert 1831; Olshausen 1835; de Wette 1835; Fritzsche 1836-43; Schott 1858; Hodge of Princeton 1864; Philippi, Third Edition, 1866; Lange, Bibelwerk 1868; von Hofmann 1868; Meyer, Fifth Edition, 1872; Volkmar 1875; Godet 1881; Klostermann, Correcturen zur

bisherigen Erklaerung des Roemerbriefs 1881; Weiss 1886; Otto 1886; Luthardt, Strack-Zoechler'scher Commentar 1887, Ebrard 1890. Of the Roman (Catholic) theologians who have occupied themselves with the Letter to the Romans, there are mentioned W. Este and Cornelius and Lapidé from the 17th century, A. Meyer and Bisping of recent times. In our exposition we have taken into consideration more or less most of the commentators mentioned, besides many monographs regarding occasion character, tendency, or some special parts of the Letter, as well as explanations of the foremost sedes doctrinae contained in the Letter from ancient and recent times. Here we avoid any consideration of any characterization of the different exegetical peculiarities and theological inclinations of the expositors, since these shall come out sufficiently in the exposition.

CHAPTER I

1:1-7 The Greeting

1:1.2.

Paul introduces himself to the readers of his Letter as a servant of Jesus Christ and a called Apostle. With the expression "slave of Jesus Christ (δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) he really points, as in Ga 1:10; Php 1:1, to his official position, which gave him occasion for this document. Then he passes over from the general to the specific in that he designates this service as apostleship. He is called "Apostle" (ἀπόστολος) in the real, full sense of the Word. Like the twelve Apostles of Israel he was called directly by the Lord (Acts 9:1ff; Gal 1:12). At his conversion and then when He appeared to him again in the Temple at Jerusalem, the Lord had said to him: "I will send you far to the Gentiles, to whom I now send you" (ἐγὼ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶ σε. εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ αποστέλλω σε . .) (Acts 22:21; 26:17). Even though he had not gone in and out with the Lord in the days of His flesh, like the Twelve (Acts 1:21.22), still the other prerogatives of the apostleship the office of eye- and earwitnessing, were not lacking to him (1 John 1:1). He had seen the Lord, the Risen One, with his own eyes (1 Cor 15:8) and then had frequently received direct instruction from Him concerning the things which he should teach (1 Cor 11:23; 15:3). As an Apostle, Paul "had been separated" for the Gospel of God, namely, to proclaim the same. The perfect ἀφωρισμένος shows that the "separation or selection"

which took place in and with his calling, continued in its effect. Since his calling Paul continually performed the special service of proclaiming the Gospel orally and in writing. We translate εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ as "The Gospel of God", not "a message of God." It is the Gospel, well known to the Christians, which is meant. Such customary substantives as εὐαγγέλιον, "Gospel," often stand without an article, even if they are meant in a definite sense, to designate a definite thing, a definite person. Thus νόμος often means the Mosaic Law, πίστις the Christian faith, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ the righteousness which avails before God, θεός God the Father, κύριος the Lord Christ, πνεῦμα ἁγίου the Holy Spirit (Cf. Winer, Grammatik. Para. 19). The Gospel which Paul preaches is God's Gospel, a message which stems from God. What Paul proclaims, orally and in writing, is God's Word.

And this Gospel is no new doctrine, but "the very ancient truth, proclaimed beforehand by the most faithful witnesses, laid down in authenticated writings" (Philippi). Precisely this Gospel contains the message which God had proclaimed afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures. In the number of the prophets whom God had taken into His service belong all the holy men of the Old Covenant, who prophesied concerning Christ and the salvation in Christ, also Moses and David. And it was God Himself who had spoken thru the Prophets. The prophecies of the Prophets are laid down in the Scriptures and it is God Himself who speaks in the Scriptures. Under "in the Holy writings" (γραφαῖς ἁγίας) we understand not just any sacred writings or holy documents, but the sacred Scriptures of Israel, the Old Testament canon. As here in the introduction of the Letter to the Romans, so also otherwise, Paul

often referred to the fact that his doctrine corresponds to the testimony of the Prophets. "We declare unto you . . . the promise which was made unto the fathers" (Acts 13:32). "I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come" (Acts 26:22). That is also very comforting for us that we know that the preaching of the Gospel, which is still current among us, is nothing else than the ancient truth which God manifested to His people from the beginning

1:3-5.

After the Apostle has pointed to the divine source of the Gospel for which he was chosen, as well as to its agreement with the Scriptures, he names the content of the same. We refer "concerning His Son" (περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ) to the chief concept "the Gospel of God" (εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ). It is the Gospel of God concerning His Son. God Himself testifies here concerning His Son. Thus in Rm 15:19 Paul designates this Gospel as the Gospel of Christ. Concerning Christ have all the Prophets prophesied, to Christ the whole Scripture points. And Christ is indeed the Son of God. "His Son," "God's Son" is here as elsewhere in the Scriptures, not merely the title of the office of the Messiah, but here, as everywhere in the Scripture, these words point to the unique relationship of Christ to God. Christ appears to the Apostle Paul in the same manner as to the Apostle John, as "the only begotten of the Father" (Jn 1:14). In this Letter he calls Him God's "own Son" (R 8:32), and therefore "God over all" (R 9:5). In Col 1:15 he writes concerning Him: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature,

for by him were all things created." In the prophetic Scriptures already God testified concerning the Messiah: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee" (Ps 2:7).

The content of the Gospel "concerning his Son" is modified by two attributes. First, it is stated that the Son of God "was born," (τοῦ γενομένου) "of the Seed of David," that is, from the family of David, "according to the flesh," that is, with regard to His human nature. The Son of God who had been from eternity, had, in the fulness of time, in conformity with the promises of the Prophets, assumed the flesh and blood of the children of men from Mary, a daughter of David. He remained who He was; He received the human nature into the unity of His Person. For this new existence into which He entered with His earthly birth, the flesh was now first of all the deciding factor. He became like His brethren in all things; He was "found in fashion as man." In the incarnate Son of God one perceived in His visible walk upon earth all the peculiarities, also the weaknesses and infirmities of the human nature. But then there entered a change in circumstances to which the second attribute calls our attention.

It reads further, v.4: "the One who was designated the Son of God in Power" (τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει). ὀρίζεσθαι signifies "to fix the limits of," "to decide, determine"; "to define" in profane Greek and also in the New Testament (cf. Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23; 11:29; 17:26.31; Heb. 4:7). Joined with a double accusative of the person it means nothing other than: "to designate someone for something" (e.g., Acts 10:42), or also "to make one into something," "to appoint," "to establish one in a function, in an office," constituere. The latter

definition, according to which the verb includes the thing accomplished, is without doubt established by the word of the author in Meleag (Anth. Pal. 12, 158, 7: σε γὰρ θεὸν ὥρϊσε δαίμων, "a demon designated you a god"). In this sense the word is also employed in the document under consideration, since here only an act can be meant which follows upon the act first mentioned, "the One who was born" (τοῦ γενομένου).

"ὁρισθέντος, designated" of our passage corresponds to ἐποίησε "he made" in Acts 2:36: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

But it would be absurd if it would read that the Son of God, who was this from the beginning, had been established or appointed as the Son of God. Therefore, as also Philippi, Hofman, Weiss, and already ancient expositors construe it, we combine υἱοῦ θεοῦ with the following ἐν δυνάμει into one concept: Christ was designated to be "the Son of God with power" (Constitutus est filius Dei potens). He has been established in the position of absolute, divine majesty and power, in the state of glory, status gloriae. First, in the state of His humiliation, He had given place to the weakness of the human nature, had kept His divine majesty hidden behind the form of a servant. But then He entered into the full possession and use of His divine omnipotence and glory. And certainly the latter is said precisely of the Son of God who had come according to the flesh from the family of Dauid. The Son of David is now the Son of God in power. The incarnate Son of God now rules also according to His human nature in unlimited, divine omnipotence. The expression "the Son of God with power" is further defined by κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης, "according to the spirit of holiness." πνεῦμα in

contrast to κατὰ σάρκα, designates what it does in I Tm 3:16; I Pe 3:18; (cf. also He 9:14), the higher essence or the "divine principle" in Christ, as well as the "higher, heavenly, divine nature of Christ" (Philippi).

The Son of God, like God the Father, is πνεῦμα, (John 4:24), and is directly called τὸ πνεῦμα (II Cor 3:17). This πνεῦμα is a spirit of holiness in the sense that God is and is called the Holy One in the sense of divine transcendence. The Apostle here uses the usual expression πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης "spirit of holiness" instead of πνεῦμα ἅγιον "Holy Spirit," so that one does not think of the third Person of the Godhead who is generally designated as the Holy Spirit. The κατὰ here, as the facts themselves bear out, points not so much to the relation, but rather to the norm. Christ is now the Son of God in majesty and officiates as such according to His divine, heavenly way and nature. It is the eternal Godhead which now predominates in Christ and determines His entire being, His mode of existence. That Christ is true God in essence is borne out by the fact that He has and exercises all power in heaven and on earth. The divine form and nature with its heavenly splendor also penetrates and shines through His human essence. Christ now exists in a spiritual, heavenly, glorified body and life. The Apostle concludes this description of the status gloriae with the addition ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, "by the resurrection of the dead." The ἐξ does not point to the temporal but to the actual result. Through His resurrection from the dead Christ has been translated into the state of divine glory, into His former heavenly existence, equal to God. Christ died and with His death He has forever laid aside the human weakness. For He has risen from the dead, and as a result of this He is now the Son of God with power according to

the Spirit of holiness. It does not read ἐξ ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ, altho self-evidently Christ's resurrection is meant. The emphasis lies on the concept ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν "resurrection from the dead." The Apostle emphasizes that it was a resurrection from the dead which Christ experienced in Himself, and that it is therefore a life out of death, an entirely new life and being, in which Christ now stands in an entirely different life than that into which He had first entered in His physical birth. Moreover, what Paul says here of the humiliation and exaltation of Christ is prophesied by the Prophets of God (e.g., Ps 22; Is 53).

After the Apostle has painted in the brightest light the Person of Him of whom his Gospel treats, he designates Him with His historical name, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and adds to that τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Thereby he reminds us what we Christians have in this Christ. This Jesus Christ, as He is here described, is our Lord. The Son of God has redeemed us with His life, suffering, and death in the flesh and thereby won us for Himself. He is the Lord who has been exalted to God, who now blesses us out of His divine fulness, guides and rules, guards and protects us with His divine power and omnipotence. He is our Lord, and we are His own; He is the Lord whom we serve, to whom we live and die.

It is also this Lord Jesus Christ, to whom Paul owes the special grace which had been imparted to him: "by whom we have received grace and apostleship." According to the common usage of language Paul speaks of himself as the author of the Letter in the first person plural. He had received a special gift of grace (cf. Eph 3:8), namely his apostleship. Χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν is an hendiadys. Through the Lord Christ he had received this gift. The οὐδ' οὐ does not obligate us to

regard Christ only as the mediator of grace, but to regard God the Father as the real originator of the same. Where $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\alpha\iota$ is not expressly set over against the $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}$ it is often, as Grimm says, used de causa efficiente (as the effecting cause) as well as qui pariter auctor et instrumentum actionis est (which is both the author and the instrument of the action). $\delta\epsilon\iota'$ $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$ I Cor 1:9 that we are called "through Him" In Ga 1:1 Paul attests that he had become an Apostle just as much through Christ as through God the Father. He also traces his apostleship at one time back to Christ, at another time back to God the Father (Ro 15:15). In the report of the calling Paul in the Acts of the Apostles the exalted Christ appears especially as the One who called and sent Paul to the Gentiles. Correspondingly we take Christ in our passage simply as the distributor of the gift which Paul received. The purpose of his apostleship Paul states in the words: $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \dot{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\eta\nu\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\theta\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ that is, "to establish the obedience of faith among the Gentiles." He had been called especially to the Gentiles (Ro 1:14; 11:13; 15:16; Eph 3:8). By his service the obedience of faith should come to pass among the Gentiles. In the expression $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\eta\nu\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ the latter word is epexegetical genitive. The obedience consists in faith. The Christian faith is essentially obedience to the Word of God, therefore the expressions $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ "they obeyed the Gospel" (Ro 10:16; II Thess 1:8); $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega$ "to disbelieve the Word" or $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ or "the Gospel" (I Pe 2:8; 4:17). Paul was [chosen] as an Apostle for the proclamation of the Gospel of God concerning His Son. This preaching, however, works faith in that concerning which it speaks; the Gospel of God itself works faith, acceptance. This faith serves for the glorification of the name of Christ, $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ "in behalf of His name." When the believing Gentiles call upon Christ as their Lord, they honor and praise His name. This statement of Paul concerning his apostleship in v.5 is not only outwardly joined to the former remarks by $\delta\epsilon\iota'$ $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$, but stands in closest connection with it. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord, of whom The Gospel treats, proves His divine power and dominion also in this that He Himself chooses, calls, and prepares instruments, like Paul, who proclaim this Gospel, and that through these human instruments and their preaching He Himself works the obedience of faith to the honor of His name.

1:6.7.

Now the Apostle turns to the recipients of this Letter, the Roman Christians. The majority belong to the Gentiles who are already the called of Jesus Christ. The genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is not to be taken as the genitivus causai, but as the genitive of relationship. God the Father otherwise always appears in the letters of Paul as the One who calls those who are afar off, as He calls them to Christ (Cf. Ro 8:30; 9:24; 1 Cor 1:9; 7:15.17; 1 Th 2:12; 2 Th 2:14; 2 Tm 1:9). God had called those who are now Christians, and by the power of this call they now belong to Jesus Christ. The expressions κλητός, κλήσις, καλεῖν ("called," "calling," "to call") in the Pauline Epistles, where the discussion concerns the general Christian call, always designates a call which is not only powerful and active, but it is effective in itself. Calling is identical with conversion. Through the call of God which goes out in the Gospel we are called, drawn to Christ, and transplanted into the communion with the Son of God, Jesus Christ (1 Cor 1:9). Thus κλητοί in itself (e.g. Ro 8:28; 1 Cor 1:24), has become characteristic title of the Christians. In our passage, v. 7, as, for example, also in 1 Cor 1:1, they are called κλητοὶ ἁγίου, "called saints." Through the call of God they have become saints, separated from the world and consecrated to God. Non ideo vocati sunt, quia sancti erant, sed ideo sancti effecti, quia vocati sunt. (Augustine "They have not been called because they were saints, but they have been made saints because they were called.") The other surname of the Roman Christians and Christians in general, ἀγαπητοὺς θεοῦ, v.7, since it is placed before the κλητοὺς ἁγίους, points to the fact that God has proved His great love to those who are now Christians in that He called them, made them into believers and saints. To these Gentile Christians in Rome, who are therefore the beloved of God, the Called of Jesus Christ, the called saints, Paul now turns; to them he presents his greetings; for them this Epistle is meant. The simple dative, τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ("to those who are in Rome") includes in itself greetings and dedication, as in other letter headings. Certainly the Apostle turns to all (πᾶσιν) who are in Rome, to the collective members of the local congregation, who appear to him as the beloved of God and called saints, just as we also regard all the members of the orthodox

Christian congregation in love as the beloved children of God, as beloved fellow-Christians, and should not let ourselves be urged and influenced by the fact that hypocrites are also intermingled among the Christians. Naturally it is hereby presumed that those members of a Christian congregation who become manifest as non-Christians are then also separated from the congregation.

As he had just characterized himself, vv. 1-5, Paul directs this writing to the Roman Christians. As a called Apostle, commissioned especially to the Gentiles, he speaks to the Christians in Rome and first proclaims to them in writing the Gospel which he had been selected to proclaim. Even though they had already come to the obedience of faith without his assistance, still as their Apostle he would strengthen and promote them in the faith. His Gospel, however, including that which he writes in this Letter, is the Gospel of God, God's Word. Thus it is firm as a rock, the all-certain truth. The content of his Gospel stands in close relationship to the principal content of this Letter. It offers no complete christological discussions, but treats of soteriological subjects, above all, the subject of our redemption and justification. The article concerning the divinity of Christ, to which the Apostle points so emphatically in the introduction of our Letter, also stands in the center of soteriology. If Christ is not the only-begotten Son of God, true God in essence, then our redemption, justification, and salvation also fall away.

Instead of closing with the usual *χαίρετε* in the epistolary greetings, the Apostle ends his greeting with the Christian benediction: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ." *Χάρις*, grace, is the free goodness and favor of God, which proves itself especially in the forgiveness of sins; *εἰρήνη*, peace, is the objective condition of peace in which we stand to God. Believing Christians already have grace and peace. Thus the wish of the Apostle is that grace and peace increase so that they become established in their condition of grace, in their relationship of peace to God. May God, our Father, who has been reconciled to us through Christ, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who has merited grace and peace for us, grant that to them! Both nouns are dependent upon

ἀπό . Christ appears together with the Father as "coordinate cause of salvation" (Luthardt). That presumes, however, that Christ is coordinated with the Father according to His essence, according to His Person.

1:8-15. The Introduction of the Letter.

1:8-10:

The Apostle does not begin the Letter itself, with an assurance that he always gives thanks to God for the readers, but, as in the Second Letter to the Corinthians, with a thanksgiving. "Thanks always stands at the beginning in the Christian life and reasonably precedes all petitions and wishes." (Luthardt). It reads: Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου. The μὲν, which was no correlative in the following, serves only to bring the πρῶτον, "first" into prominence. The Apostle calls the God to whom he gives thanks, his God. Hoc verbum, Deus meus, exprimit fidem, amorem, spem atque adeo totam religionem veram. (Bengle "This word 'my God' gives expression to faith, love, hope and even to true religion itself.") The expression refers both to his personal relationship as well as to his "whose I am and whom I serve," οὗ εἰμι ὃ καὶ λατρεύω, (Acts 27:23). Paul gives thanks to his God through Jesus Christ; the thanks is mediated through Christ, even as it is a benefit mediated through Christ, merited and earned by Christ. The beloved name of Jesus Christ, which Paul had already mentioned three times in the superscription, stands also at the head of the Letter itself. That for which the Apostle gives thanks to his God is the faith of his readers, the Roman Christians. He thanks God for them all, and especially for the fact that their faith is spoken of in the whole world. Everywhere in the whole civilized world men spoke of the fact that there was now also a group of believing Christians in Rome, the capital of the world. That the faith of the Romans became so well known is proof of the genuineness and purity of their faith. In this manner the Christ in whom the Christians believe was at the same time generally known, and likewise had become the general topic of the day. How could the Apostle to the Gentiles not rejoice and give thanks to God, that now also already in the very center of the Gentile world the obedience of faith had been established, and that from there the report of Christ had spread through the entire Roman Empire?

Such giving of thanks may evade observation; it is a secret transaction between him and his God. Therefore, Paul appeals to God as a

witness. God knows how incessantly he recalls the Roman congregation before His countenance. The latter should receive an impression from that as to how he is minded toward them. The Roman congregation, which had arisen without his activity and had remained personally unacquainted with him until this time, lay on his heart just like those Gentiles congregations which he had founded. In this connection the Apostle remarks that he served God in his spirit in the Gospel of His Son: $\tilde{\omega}$ λατρεῶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ . He serves God in Gospel of Christ which he proclaims, and this service is a service to God, λατρεία, a sacrifice, which he presents to God, and certainly at the same time an innerservice to God. The modifier ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου does not say that he performed such service only outwardly for appearances' sake, only mechanically, but that his inward self, his heart, was in it. This was self understood and was of no consequence to be mentioned here. Paul rather calls attention to the fact that he takes the service of the Gospel into his inner life, and thus also into his prayer life. A righteous servant of the Word serves God in the Gospel not only when he deals with men and publicly and privately proclaims the Word, but also then, when he converses with his God alone, when he before God and with God considers how he might best carry out his office, how he might correctly impart the Word, and when he prays for those whom he serves with the Word. Thus Paul prays for the Roman Christians. While he is still absent, and he performs the duties of the apostolic office.

The Apostle remembers the Christians in Rome not only in the giving of thanks but also in petitions. At all times he also pleads in his prayers whether it might finally be granted him to come to them. εἴ πως ἤδη ποτὲ εὐοδωθήσομαι , etc. Εὐδοῦν means really "to have an un-hindered journey," but in the passive, in the classical as well as in the New Testament Greek, it always has the tropical meaning "to have good results, 'fortune,'" "to be successful" (Cf. 1 Cor 16:2; 3 John 2). Paul adds: ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ , "by the will of God." The result is in the hand and will of God. God, whose omnipotent hand directs and fashions the circumstances, can very well direct and ordain it in due time and let the Apostle have the good fortune to come to Rome.

1:11.12.

The Apostle now gives the basis of his petition. He was anxious to see the Roman Christians face to face, so that he might impart to them some spiritual gift through the proclamation of the Gospel. What he works among them through instruction, exhortation and comfort is not ascribed to Paul's personal influence but is χάρισμα πνευματικόν, a gift of the grace of God which was imparted to them through the Spirit of God. It is the Spirit of God who works all good in man through human speech. The purpose of such communication is that they might be strengthened and established. They already stand in faith, but still they need the strengthening of faith. At the same time that he instructs and strengthens them, Paul himself receives a blessing. That he strengthens them, τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, includes a reciprocal encouragement, συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν. Such mutual help and strengthening takes place through the mutual faith, their faith and his, οὐδὲ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ. In Roman Christians dwelt and lived the same faith which moved the Apostle. When Paul & they are together, both would prove to one another their mutual faith, he his in that he would teach and instruct them and present testimony to them of his faith, they their's in that they would accept with joy his word as God's Word. The former would redound to the strengthening and encouragement of the Roman Christians; the latter to the strengthening and encouragement of the Apostle. The instruction from God's Word is never one-sided, that the one only gives, the other only receives. Reciprocal action always takes place. Whoever teaches and strengthens others himself receives blessings and is himself edified in that he becomes aware of how the Word takes effect and is kindled in the hearers and proves itself as a power of God.

1:13-15.

The Apostle has just stated that he wished and prayed that he might finally have the joy of coming to Rome. He had long had such a journey in mind. Now he expressly assures his beloved Roman Christians, that he had often proposed to come to them (cf. Acts 19:21), but he had previously been hindered in carrying out his intention. What hindered him he states in 15:20-22. He was first of all appointed to proclaim Christ in all places in the East where the name of Christ was still not known. A more immediate task had held him back. There was no motive in himself for post-

poning the projected journey. Least of all had indifference toward the Roman congregation which had arisen without his assistance, kept him away from Rome. The purpose of his intended visit was: ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν, "He also wanted to have some fruit in Rome, the same as among the other Gentile nations." With the ἐν ὑμῖν, "among you", he speaks to his readers not as Christians but as Romans. (So also Hofmann, Schott, Godet observe). With the "fruit" he does not mean only the result of his labor in general. The fruit which the Apostle otherwise had consisted in the Gentiles converts whom he had won for Christ. Such living fruit, consisting of human souls, the Lord has in mind when he says: "He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." John 4:36. So also in Rome Paul would like to win some Gentiles for the Kingdom of Heaven. In other large cities, e.g. Corinth and Ephesus, he had gathered a full harvest. In Rome, on the other hand, where a congregation was already established, he would be content if he could add only a handful of ears to the sheaves gathered by another. His expectation there was only "some fruit," τινὰ καρπόν. He would like to have fruit. The converted Gentiles are fruit, again for him. The souls which a preacher of the Gospel has won for Christ with his preaching shall be accredited to him by the Lord of the Harvest as having been won by him; they shall be set to his account, so that he can boast of his gain on the day of Jesus Christ (Php 2:16). Paul has a twofold objective in mind with his projected journey to Rome. With the preaching of the Gospel he would strengthen the Christians and win still other Gentiles.

The following statement, v. 14, connects the purpose of the Apostle to come to Rome, back to the obligation which had been laid upon him with the Gentile apostleship. He is a debtor, ὀφειλέτης, to all the Gentile nations. With his call he had received and assumed a debt over against the entire Gentile world which he now is paying with the proclamation of the Gospel. The Apostle here differentiates between two classes of Gentiles, the Greeks and the barbarians. Otto quotes on this from Dionysius of Halicarnassos: neque enim nuda appellatione aut linguae dumtaxat proprietate Graecos a barbaris distinguere velim, sed prudentia bonisque institutis et moribus ("for not only by the mere name and language do I especially wish that the Greek be distinguished from the barbarian, but by wisdom and by good institutions and custom. Thus this differentiation falls in line

with the others, the differentiation between the wise and the unwise, the educated and the uneducated. Self-evidently the Romans are included in the first class, as Cicero once remarked, de fin. 2,15: non solum Graecia et Italia, sed etiam omnis barbaria (not only Greece and Italy, but even every foreign country.") To the one as to the other Paul owed the Gospel. Thus it is well to say: The Gospel of Christ is meant for the uncivilized nations as for the civilized. Barbarism is as little a hindrance to the effectiveness of the Gospel as worldly culture and education are useful to it.

What Paul has to say concerning his wish and intention to come to Rome he concludes in v. 15 with the words: οὕτως τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῶν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελισσάσθαι. It is inadmissible, as Meyer does, to separate τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ from πρόθυμον and to take the sentence in the sense: "Therefore, as far as I am concerned, I am prepared," etc. For πρόθυμον alone is not synonymous with προθυμία ἐστί, "it is in readiness", or πρόθυμός εἰμι, "I am ready." Rather we take τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον as one expression, and we rather translate with Weiss and Philippi by adding ἐστί: "Therefore my willingness is, to preach the Gospel also to you, the Romans," than with Hofmann: "So it is with the willingness that is in me." Thus the meaning is this: Therefore, because I owe the Gospel to all Gentiles, Greeks and barbarians, I am prepared on my part to preach the Gospel also to you Romans. Until now God had still not made it possible, but rather hindered him, from beginning the work for which he was ready and willing.

From Paul's desire and intention to come to them the Roman Christians could discover his attitude toward them. They would the more willingly give ear to what he was writing. To be sure, the Apostle was still not in a position where he could in the near future, preach the Gospel to the Romans (Ro 15:24ff.). Therefore he sent them this Letter, which in the meanwhile should compensate for his oral preaching.

1:16,17. The Theme of the Letter

Why the Apostle had such a strong desire to preach the Gospel in Rome he establishes by stressing the quality and content of his Gospel. He is not ashamed of the Gospel. It does not alter the facts whether or not one ready τοῦ Χριστοῦ after τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in v.16. In any case Paul has in mind the Gospel, which, as he had attested previously, speaks of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord. Of this Gospel he did not need to be ashamed even in Rome, the world capital, the center of worldly education and culture. Why not? It is a power of God to salvation. It is εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, a message which stems from God (cf. 1:1) and therefore God's power is active in it. This divine power grants what no human

teaching nor worldly philosophy is able to grant: It helps man to salvation. With σωτηρία is evidently here meant, as often in the New Testament, the completed salvation, "the eternal blessedness." At the very beginning Paul names the last, the highest purpose which the Gospel serves, the finis ultimus of the preaching of the Gospel. He characterizes the message which had been given to him in 1 Cor 15:1ff: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you ... by which also ye are saved," δι' οὗ καὶ σώζεσθε . And James points to the high, incomparable worth of the New Testament Word with the remark: "which is able to save your souls," τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, (1:21). For everyone who believes, who accepts it in faith, the Gospel is the power of God to salvation, be he Jew or Greek. The prerogative of Judaism, which the Jews asserted over against the Gentiles, was that the living God had manifested Himself to this people, had revealed His will, His Law to them. The Greeks, who here represented the heathen world, were the flowering of the development of natural mankind which is estranged from God. The message of salvation does not change when preached to different audiences. Jews and Greeks need the Gospel if they would be saved. Neither the Law and the works of the Law nor worldly wisdom, education and good breeding in any way help to salvation. Only one form of prior claim did the Jews have as the previously called people in the Gospel to which the πρῶτον, "first," added to the Ἰουδαίῳ, draws attention. Therefore Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, always turned first to the Jews in his journeys, and then to the Gentiles (Acts 13:46).

The statement that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation is established in v. 17 by the fact that righteousness is revealed in it. Righteousness is a preliminary condition of salvation. What excludes man from heaven is sin. If a sinner becomes a righteous person, nothing any longer stands in the way. This righteousness is defined specifically as δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ . This expression does not here designate an essential attitude of God, neither a morally correct disposition of man brought about by God; much rather, as is almost generally acknowledged, since the righteousness is presented here as a benefit which is designated and is available for man, a real relationship of man to God, a recognized judgment of God over man, it is "a condition in which man has God on his side" (Hofmann, Luthardt), or the justitia imputata, imputed righteousness. As the later amplification of the Apostle shows, the point in question here therefore is, that man appears before God, ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, 3:20, before God, παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, 2:13; Gal. 3:11, as a righteous one, appears in the eyes of God as one who is just, as God would have him, in whom God has no fault to find. Then, however, Luther's translation, "die Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt," "the righteousness which avails before God," is exactly the adequate expression for the matter treated here. Therefore with Fritzsche,

Philippi, and the old Lutheran commentators we take Θεοῦ as objective genitive and not, as most modern commentators, as subjective genitive. In itself it is correct to see this righteousness which is regarded by God as such and which also proceeds from God, as originating with God and attributed to man (cf. Phm 3:9: τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην). As in John 12:43, ἡ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ signifies "the praise before God," so here δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ means "the righteousness before God." The expression of Paul is 2 Cor 5:21: ἵνα ἡμεῖς γινώμεθα δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ , allows as Fritzsche correctly states, no other meaning than this: "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." This righteousness which avails before God is revealed in the Gospel, "revealed," ἀποκαλύπτεται . That presumes that it is already present before it is revealed. Only of a thing which actually exists, though in a hidden manner, can it be said that it is revealed. The righteousness before God is present once and for all in Christ, of whom the Gospel speaks. Christ has completed it through His life, suffering and death in the flesh. And because Christ is God's Son, therefore it is an accomplished righteousness which completely satisfies the great and holy God. Christ, the God-man, has correctly established the relationship of man to God, has procured for sinners a gracious judgment of God. This was indeed hidden from man from the beginning. Men would have known nothing of the appearance of the Son of God in the flesh and of the foundation and purpose of the same, if it would not have been expressly revealed to them. Now, however, the righteousness merited by Christ for sinners is revealed to the children of men in the Gospel. It is made known to them, and thereby offered to them. Recent exegetes have for the most part explained the foregoing expression of the Apostle, that in the Gospel there is manifested to man how one attains righteousness or under what condition man can become righteous before God, namely, under the condition of faith. Thus, for example, Philippi: "In the Gospel it. i.e., the righteousness, is revealed, insofar as the Gospel contains the report wherein the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ consists and how it is attained." "Only the Gospel reveals the otherwise veiled way to δικαιοσύνη and to σωτηρία ." Such comments only becloud the clear text. That in the Gospel there is manifested the way to righteousness, the rule according to which man becomes righteous and is saved, Paul does not say; he does say that the righteousness itself, as a concrete message, is revealed in the Gospel. The righteousness which avails before God is placed in the Gospel not as a possibility of a future benefit, which man can attain under certain conditions, or even as a benefit to be merited by man himself, but is presented and offered as an actual, finished gift to man. In the Gospel it is not only made known to mankind that they, if they only believe, can become righteous and be saved,

but that righteousness already is present for them, that God has already set a gracious judgment over them, that God in Christ looks upon mankind with eyes of satisfaction, that the sinners have a gracious God.

To be sure, faith is a necessary annex to this righteousness which is revealed in the Gospel, but one must correctly designate the relationship of faith to righteousness. Thus the Apostle still adds to the expression in v.17a the words: ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. / It is absolutely inadmissible, with Hofmann, Luthardt, Weiss and others, to combine ἀποκαλύπτεται with the predicate of the sentence. For such an expression, that the righteousness in the Gospel is revealed as a result of faith, the assumption is that the preaching of the Gospel thus presupposes faith. This directly contradicts what the Apostle had said concerning it in 1:5. The apostolic proclamation of the Gospel which aimed at working the obedience of faith among the Gentiles seems to contradict the usual relationship of faith and preaching as it is otherwise attested in the Scriptures. The words under question, ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, are much rather to be taken as a modifier to the principal concept δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, as in 3:22 where the righteousness of God is more closely characterized as δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is a customary idiom of the New Testament also to combine different substantives without articles into one concept by means of prepositions. But then one dare scarcely join the two expressions ἐκ πίστεως and εἰς πίστιν in the sense of "out of faith into faith", so that the growth of faith would thereby be designated. For there is no reason to emphasize here what cannot be said concerning the righteousness before God, that it grows from faith to faith by itself and not in the believers. No, the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ is characterized on the one hand as a δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, on the other hand as a δικαιοσύνη εἰς πίστιν, and the change or prepositions, similarly as in 3:30, serves to correctly bring it into prominence that here everything is laid on faith, that the righteousness of God is the justitia sola fide, justification by faith alone. The righteousness of God which is manifested in the Gospel is thus first δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, "a righteousness from faith." That cannot possibly signify that the righteousness comes from or grows out of faith as a fruit, that through faith righteousness first becomes effective, or takes place, since the righteousness is made known and presented in the Gospel as a completed gift. The righteousness which avails before God is already present before preaching and faith. The meaning of the Apostle is this, that the righteousness is imparted to us and becomes our own as a result of faith. As soon as one accepts the Gospel of Christ in faith, then he has, as a result of this, also a share in the righteousness which lies prepared in the Gospel and is presented to

men. Addit vero Paulus, quo instrumento aut medio hanc justitiam Dei, id est remissionem peccatorum assequamur et nobis applicemus, nempe fide. Idcirco dixit ex fide. (Koerner "Paul indeed added by what way or means we attain this righteousness of God, i.e., the remission of sins, and how we apply it to ourselves, namely by faith. For that reason he said 'from faith'.") The δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ is, on the other hand, a δικαιοσύνη εἰς πίστιν, that is, such a righteousness which is designated and available for faith, and is intended for faith. God, who had procured a righteousness for mankind through Christ, has also established this order that man lay hold of and carry away this righteousness in faith. Man should simply receive that which God gives, thereby he then possesses and enjoys the great blessing upon which depends salvation, life and blessedness.

In order to prove that the previous discussion in vv.16.17a agrees with the scriptures of the Old Covenant, the Apostle finally appeals to a work of the Prophet, Hab 2:4: *οὕτως γέγραπται ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*, "as it is written, The just shall live by faith". He quotes from the Septuagint, omitting only the incorrect μου after πίστεως. The Hebrew test reads: *וְהַיָּשָׁרִים יִחְיֶיךָ בְּאֵמֶנֶךָ*. The meaning of the Prophet is: The righteous shall live by his faith. Faith is characteristic of a righteous one, that is, he shall live always and never pass away, while the proud and godless do not stand, but shall fall v.5. With the faith of the righteous nothing else is meant that that he "clings faithfully to God, firmly clings to the Word of promise" (Delitzsch). This prophetic statement corresponds exactly to what Paul has said concerning the way which leads to life and salvation, only that Paul places this Old Testament axiom into the context of the New Testament. The characteristic of the righteous is faith, the faith which grasps and firmly holds the promise of the Gospel. Precisely this faith makes one righteous, in that he makes the righteousness which is promised and presented in the Gospel his own. Through such faith the righteous is finally granted life, life in the full sense of the word, the eternal, perfect salvation, σωτηρία. The righteousness grasped by and in faith qualifies him for salvation.

Thus in these two verses, 1:16,17, similarly as in 1:4,5, the Apostle has presented a summary of the Gospel, only that here he clearly shows why Christ, the Son of God and the Son of David, is necessary for us. This same Gospel the Apostle would proclaim in Rome with confident courage, but first he would attest it to the Roman Christians in writing. Very correctly, therefore, ancient and modern commentators see in this sentence, vv.16.17, a short resume of the document under consideration or the real theme of the Letter to the Romans.

1:18-32. The Deep Moral Degeneracy of the Gentile World

1:18-20.

In contrast to the revelation of the righteousness of God in the Gospel the Apostle now speaks of a manifestation of the wrath of God over all godlessness and unrighteousness of man. Ἀποκαλύπτεται in v.18 corresponds to the ἀποκαλύπτεται in v.17, ὀργή forms the contrast to σωτηρία and ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία is the counterpart of δικαιοσύνη. The connection of the statement in v.18 with the foregoing, pointed out by the γάρ, explains the necessity of faith. Without faith mankind has fallen under the wrath of God. The Gospel, which reveals the righteousness of faith, is necessary in order to save the world from wrath. Thus, e.g. Meyer, Philippi, Godet. But in v.18 and the following nothing is said of the lack of faith, and in the preceding nothing is said of the necessity of faith or of the Gospel. The fact is simply attested that the Gospel is the power of God to salvation because it reveals the righteousness of faith. Weiss and Hofmann refer the γάρ to v.16a: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." This appears rather forced, since the latter statement lies far back and has received a sufficient emphasis already in vv.16.17. The thought connection is designated most exactly by Fritzsche, when he writes: Fide autem integer factus sempiternum beatus erit. Quippe (ut contrarium exsequar) Dei ira ... de coelo patefit omnesque, ut scites, impios et improbos homines corripit (the man whole by faith will have been made forever blessed. The opposite follows, indeed that the wrath of God has been revealed from heaven and it holds all men as reprobates and depraved). In vv.17.18 the Apostle asserted that his Gospel helps man to salvation because it reveals the righteousness which avails before God, which righteousness becomes our own through faith. He has thereby stated that righteousness is the foundation and preliminary condition of salvation. He who has become righteous through faith shall receive life and salvation, as this is also attested by the statement of the prophet Habakkuk. This latter truth is proven now in v.18 by the contrary fact, namely, that all godlessness and unrighteousness draws upon itself the wrath of God. Thus also Luthardt remarks on γάρ in v.18: "Now begins the proof of the preceding from its opposite." The wrath of God is "the inner reaction of the divine holiness against sin as an anti-godly thing." That is first of all an agitation, which is hidden within God, which, however, is then "revealed" and comes down as punishment, judgment and condemnation upon all godlessness and unrighteousness of man. Ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία have a certain relation to one another as irreligiousness and immorality. The former is the personal misconduct against God, the latter is the denial and violation of the divine norm which God has set for the conduct of mankind. But when and how does God's wrath manifest itself

over godless and unrighteous mankind? Some have here thought of a revelation of the divine wrath in the Gospel or in the Law or in the reason or conscience, or they recalled the manifold evil and punishment of this time, or the fate into which God has given man according to v.24 and v.28. But all these interpretations do not agree with the solemn declaration: Ἀποκαλύπτεται ὁργὴ Θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ. It is first of all well to consider what Fritzsche and Philippi remark as to ἀποκαλύπτεται : Refertur ἀποκαλύπτεται ad res, quae extraordinario quodam Dei instituto hominibus innotescunt (Eph 3:5), discriminaturque ab humana institutione ἡ ἀποκάλυψις h.e. Dei institutio, quae extraordinaria est et praeter naturae ordinem legemque fit v.e. per angelum, per somnium, per spiritus s. afflatum. GA 1:12, Eph 3:3 ("to reveal refers to things which are made known to mortals by a certain extraordinary arrangement of God, and 'the revelation' is distinguished from human arrangements, i.e., the arrangement of God which is extraordinary and is done beyond the order and law of nature, e.g. through an angel, through sleep, or through a spirit (without glowing)"). Ἀποκαλύπτειν , to reveal something hidden, like the substantive ἀποκάλυψις in the New Testament, when God is the revealing subject, always refers to an extraordinary revelation through a wonderful act." Therefore we cannot consider the manifestation of the wrath of God as mediated through natural means or events, nor through the Gospel or the Work of Scripture in general. The addition ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ , "from heaven," speaks against that. Not the visible heaven is meant, but heaven as the residence of the omnipotent, majestic God. The God who dwells and is enthroned in heaven is the One who is over all the world, who has power over the entire world. From out of God's transcendence the wrath of God is revealed and poured out over all godlessness and unrighteousness of men, over the entire godless and unrighteous generation of man, so that none can escape it. When one reads and considers this, does not there then come to mind the great, solemn, singular, majestic revelation of the wrath of God on the last day, on the day of judgment? That was the impression which also the ancient Greek church fathers received from the words of Paul and to which more recently Ewald, Philippi and Ritschl, have given acceptance. Ἀποκαλύπτεται does not stand in the way of this concept. The New Testament also otherwise speaks of the final judgment as a present and certain fact (Cf. Ro 2:2: Οὐδ' αὖτε οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς, ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 2 Th 1:8: ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν. 1 Pe 1:17: τὸν ἀπροσώπολῆπτως κρίνοντα etc.) Similarly it says of the Antichrist who should still be revealed: οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία , etc. (2 Th 2:9) One must add that Paul and the Scriptures in general describe the great catastrophe of the Last Day with the same expressions as we find here. On that day

the Son of Man shall be revealed, Luke 17:30 (Where the present tense of ἀποκαλύπτεται is used). From heaven we look for the Savior Jesus Christ (Phm 3.). "The Lord himself shall descent from heaven" (1 Th 4:16). "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God" (2 Th 1:6ff). Likewise what the Apostle says further in his Letter concerning the wrath of God, 2:5: "After thy hardness and impenitent heart treasure up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation, ἀποκαλύψεως, of the righteous judgment of God," are parallel to 1:18. The meaning of Paul is that the men who judge others experience the same fate as the others and shall fall under the same wrath, which shall be revealed against all godless, unrighteous men.

The godless and unrighteous men are still more closely characterized by the addition τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικία κατεχόντων, as such "who suppress the truth through unrighteousness." The verb κατέχειν is not used here as meaning "hold firmly," but in the other meaning, "arrest," "hold down," "hinder," as, for example, in 2 Th 2:7. Mankind possesses the truth. The truth also contains the norm for the correct conduct of men. The truth penetrates them, urges and obligates them to a conduct which is agreeable to God. But they oppose the truth and suppress it so that among them it does not come to its full right. Veritas nititur in mente et urget, sed homo impedit eam (Truth in the understanding strives and urges; but man hinders it). (Bengel) Men serve unrighteousness-- the ἀδικία "unrighteousness" here at the same time includes the ἀσέβεια "impiety"--they do the opposite of the truth, and thus they hinder its effect, so that it does not strike roots in their hearts, does not succeed in their life and conduct, and does not play its proper role. Thus this phrase emphasizes the severe guilt of man. Their godlessness and unrighteousness does not come from ignorance, but from an inexcusable wrong-doing, which opposes their own better knowledge. Therefore they shall justly incur the wrath of God. But what is meant by the truth, which men suppress, the following statement in v. 19 shows: ^{ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανερώσεν.} διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν "wherefore the knowable thing of God is manifest among them for God manifested it to them." Many commentators find here a further description of the guilt of mankind and a further statement of the cause for which the wrath of God comes. But then one must add a thought such as this, that men do not obey what is manifested to them, (e.g. Hofmann), though the text says nothing of this. Therefore we take διότι, a strengthened ὅτι, as ὅτι "because" in 1 Cor 1:25, in the explicative sense; the

sentence introduced by it serves as the explanation of the concept τὴν ἀλήθειαν , "the truth" v. 18. Luthardt: " Διότι serves to explain that original possession of the truth, therefore it closely belongs to the foregoing." Τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ we translate with the ancient expositors, and among the recent ones, Weiss, Hofmann, Godet: "that which may be known of God," and thus we take γνωστός in the meaning customary to profane Greek. The other meaning, which the word has otherwise in the New Testament, "known", would present a pure tautology in our passage: What is known of God is manifest to them. That is the truth which the Apostle here has in mind: That which may be known of God is made known to all men, also to natural man; or God Himself, insofar as He is capable of being known. This is manifest to them, in the hearts of men; for God Himself has manifested it to them, in that He has written into their hearts the knowledge of Himself, a notitia Dei (the knowledge of God). It is well to note that this natural revelation of God is designated with the expressions φανερόν and ἐφανερώσε, not with ἀποκαλύπτειν "to bring to light."

The following sentence, v. 20, introduced with γάρ "for," serves again for the clarification of the foregoing statement. That revelation of God and all knowledge of God, which has been imparted to mankind, is mediated through the works of creation. The Apostle speaks of the "invisible essence of God," τὰ αὐρατά αὐτοῦ. With the plural he points to the diversity of the divine essence, and emphasizes: τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ καθορᾶται "God's invisible essence shall be seen." Καθορᾶν "to perceive" is only a strengthened ὁρᾶν "to see." That is an Oxymoron, which finds its explanation in the participle modifier ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα "since the creation of the world being understood by the things being made." The invisible God is seen, in that He is observed in the works of creation. The expression ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου is a designation of time, like ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως , "from the beginning of the world" Mk 10:6; 13:19; 1 Pe 3:4, and ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου , "from the foundation of the world," Mt 25:34. The verb νοεῖν denotes an activity of the νοῦς , the reason, a mental perception or an inner observation. The invisible essence of God is perceived inwardly, but insofar as this mental perception is mediated through the visible things of this world, one can also say that the invisible is seen. Since the world was created, man has before his eyes the existence of the world, the works of creation. As he views and contemplates these he becomes aware of what lies on beyond the visible world, but what likewise has impressed itself on the visible world, even the invisible essence of God. One becomes aware of two aspects of the invisible God. First, His eternal power,

ἡ αἰδολος αὐτοῦ δύναμις "His eternal power." αἰδος from αἰε "enduring always." When one observes the magnificent world, this is the first and foremost impression which one receives, that there is a God, who is exalted over world and time, and that the eternal God has created the ends of the earth (Cf. Is 40:28). The completed work, ποιήματα, points back to the initial cause: the work praises its master. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament shows his handiwork"! i.e. it declares, that the hand of the Almighty has prepared them. On the other hand the visible world gives testimony of the θεότης of God, θεότης means divinity, and it points to the divine nature and to the incomparable greatness and majesty of God, magnificentia Dei (splendour of God), μεγαλειότης τοῦ Θεοῦ "majesty of God" (Luke 9:43). The concept θεότης is more general and comprehensive than the first, ἡ αἰδολος αὐτοῦ δύναμις; θεότης is the epitome of divine perfection. Even now this visible world, with the splendor, the fullness, the riches, and the beauty of the creatures is a kind of reflection of the δόξα, "glory" of the majestas (majesty) of the invisible God. For the usefulness of all created things, as they serve mankind, points in particular to God's wisdom and goodness. Documentations of ancient heathen are expressed in the following. Aristotle's de mundo, c.6: πάση θνητῇ φύσει γενόμενος ἀθεώρητος ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖται ὁ Θεός.

Cicero de divina natura, II, 72: esse praestantem aliquam aeternamque naturam et eam suspiciendam admirandamque hominum generi, pulchritudo mundi ordoque rerum coelestium cogit confiteri. A naturalistic philosophy of the world, according to which the world is supposed to have come forth of itself or to have existed eternally, or according to which nature is supposed to have provided itself so richly and beautifully, is not only unscriptural but also unreasonable.

This natural revelation of God, however, is intended to take away from mankind every excuse: εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους "so that they are without excuse." With the εἰς only the purpose can be given, not the consequence. God made himself known to mankind in the works of creation. With that He has given them the impulse to stand before Him as His creatures. The invisible essence of God, which reflects itself in the visible world, is an inalienable possession of mankind. Precisely this truth men suppress and stifle through unrighteousness, as does mankind in general. All men are perverted and corrupted from their mother's womb. The Apostle has in mind all mankind, since the fall into sin. And so mankind can present nothing as an excuse when God shall enter into judgment with them against their godlessness and unrighteousness. Nothing on the day of judgment will serve for an excuse. There will be no appeal to the fact that they had not known better.

It is basically wrong when modern theologians present the revelatio divina naturalis (natural divine) and the notitia Dei naturalis (the natural knowledge of God) as a kind of ^{revelation} means of grace, which at least brings a few men to God or nearer to God. That contradicts the purpose of the natural revelation of God as presented here by the Apostle. Only those who are converted to God through another means, through the Word, and who recognized God from His Word, really utilize this natural revelation of God aright; they give this portion of truth room in their hearts, conduct, and life.

1:21-23.

After the Apostle had shown in vv. 19, 20 wherein the truth in v. 18 consists, he now discusses further how men suppress the truth and thereby establishes (the fact) that they are without excuse and are fallen under the wrath of God. The διότι, "because" in v. 21, refers back to the immediately preceding, "so that they are without excuse." The participial clause γινόντες τοῦ Θεοῦ, we translate: "after" A.V.: "because that, when they knew." For the knowledge of God appears here as the prius (first), which goes before the conduct of man characterized in the following verbis finitis (finite words). Still that is not to be understood as if men had then lost this knowledge. This truth is regarded as a continuing possession of man, as a possession of men of all times. It was said above: "that which may be known of God is manifest in them," φανερὸν ἐστίν. All men, who have the works of creation before their eyes, perceive from that also the invisible essence of God. Even the most depraved Gentiles know or still surmise something of the fact that there is a God and what God is all about. "Polytheism bears its own judgment in itself because it constantly suppresses the idea of the one true God, which keeps emerging from its background." (Philippi). But now, although men have known God, still they do not praise and thank Him as God. They do not permit their conduct to be determined by such knowledge. "This revelation has not passed from the passive form into the active." (Godet). "This knowledge from the revelation of nature they have obtained, but only actu directo, (the act of direction), insofar as they have given themselves to recognize this self-revelation of God objectively, the actus reflexus, did not occur and they did not praise God." (Meyer). It behooved them, the truth urged them to honor and praise God as the Creator of all things and to thank Him as the Giver of every good and perfect gift. But this they have not done. Rather, they suppressed the truth, the better knowledge. The aorists οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἐδόξαν ἢ ὑψαρίστησαν "they glorified Him not as God, nor were thankful," point back to the beginning of this evil conduct of theirs. Thus they have always done, and

thus they still do, therefore the present expressions κατεχόντων , "who suppress," v. 18, and ποιοῦσιν , "they do" v. 32.

With the ἀλλά , "but" in v. 21b a contrast to the praise and thanks is introduced: "but became vain in their imaginations: ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν . Here is described first of all the mental-moral condition into which they had fallen when they turned away from the living God. With the passive expressions ἐματαιώθησαν , " ^{became} worthless ", ἐσκοτίσθησαν , "became darkened," ἐμωράνθησαν , "became fools" this condition is designated as a fate which has befallen them, while on the other hand it is their own fault that they cherish and protect such vain, foolish thoughts. They have become vain, empty in their thoughts, in that they have turned them to vain, empty, perishable things. With their senses and thoughts they have destroyed and lost themselves in the created things. Detached from God, the Creator, "the true reality," all creation is as a μάταιον "lacking truth." It is also to be considered that the expression διαλογισμοῖς is used in the New Testament only in the malo sensu (perception of wicked), as, for example, Mt 15:19; Lk 5:22; 24:38; as well as that μάταια , ματαλοῦσθαι , saepe dicitur de idolis eorumque cultu et cultoribus, 2 Kgs 17:15; Jr 2:5. Bengel. "And their foolish heart was darkened." Ἀσύνητος καρδία "foolish hearts" is a moral concept. As a συνελών "understanding" person (cf. Mt 13:2 Ro 3:11), is one who permits himself to be instructed and spoken to, ἀσύνητος is one who has no intelligence, who accepts no understanding. Men have closed their heart, their souls to the light, which penetrates into them, have allowed no influence on their moral thoughts, feelings and desires, and thus their foolish hearts were darkened. This darkening only increases the natural ignorance and blindness (Eph 4:18). The twofold fact, that they have known God and still know Him, and on the other hand, that they are completely darkened, agree well with one another. Out of the works of creation streams of light have fallen into their heart. They know something concerning God and cannot withdraw themselves from this knowledge. However this light, this knowledge does not have the slightest effect upon their moral selves, on the agitations of their thoughts, the turn of their will, in that they continually suppress its effects. What they think and judge concerning God and divine things is all wrong and perverted, as they also have not the slightest desire and inclination to give to God what is God's. There is in them no spark of spiritual light. The Apostle himself explains the figurative speech concerning the darkening of their hearts, in that he adds in v. 22 that they, in that they have presumed themselves to be wise, have become fools. With the darkening and foolishness they also began to think themselves wise.

Weiss here aptly draws attention to the fact "that the true wisdom, which stems from divine revelation, remains humbly conscious of its origin, while precisely where the real content of truth is lacking, the conceit of the self-contrived wisdom appears."

The final and most disagreeable result of this vain mind, the darkening and foolishness of men, however, is that they "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." v. 23. In this sentence, which agrees not grammatically but logically to the ἀλλά in v. 21, there comes to a climax the opposite of the praise and thanks which men really owe to God. The epitome of the section vv. 21-23 is: οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ νύχαρίστησαν ἀλλ'...ἠλλάξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου "they glorified Him not as God, nor were thankful, but . . . they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man" etc. Instead of the true, living God men give honor to a self-conceived god, instead of to the Creator they give honor to the creature. The Apostle has previously described only the moral frame of mind out of which this horrible perversion of the truth came. For the most part interpreters have pointed the words ἠλλάξαν ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης, etc. to the fact that men have confounded the glory of God with the likeness of an image or with something that is like or similar to the image of a man or an animal. But then one of the two words, ὁμοίωμα or εἰκών, would be superfluous, as also Weiss notes. Whatever is like an image is even itself an image. We take ὁμοίωμα concretely, as it is used as a rule, as a thing which is similar to another, and εἰκόνης as genitive of apposition. The similitude for which one substitutes God consists in an image of a man or an animal. Such a picture was meant to be a likeness, an image of the Godhead. Such an image was supposed to be a similitude, an image of the divinity. In their vain, dark and foolish thoughts men have changed God, of whom they still had an idea, into a creature. They altered the various divine attributes, of which the divine δόξα "glory" consists, into human or animal characteristics and assigned them to various gods. They conceived of God as a mortal being or even as an animal, and honored Him under that form, in the image of a man or an animal. They finally idolized this image itself. The double designation of the idol worship recalls the human cultus of the Greeks and Romans, as well as the animal cultus of the Egyptians. At the same time the description of heathen idolatry given here presents itself as a recollection of Ps 106:20, where it is said that "they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass." Dt 4:15ff. is an exact parallel to our passage. There the children

of Israel are called to remember that in the day when God spoke with them out of the fire from Mt. Horeb, they had seen no form, *לֹא רָאוּ* "form", of God, therefore they should not corrupt themselves, not change God into a creature and prepare for themselves any graven image of a man or woman, or animal, or bird, or creeping thing, or fish. They should not worship any image of man or animal as a form or similitude of God. To be considered is what Philippi remarks on our verse: "Thus in our verse it can be pointed out at the same time, or it can still be noted, how man in the foolishness of the unnatural worship of God has turned upside down every original divinely established order, in that he himself, created according to the image of God, now transformed God according to his image, and, having set (Him) as the Lord of the animal world, degraded himself and became their worshipping servant." What the Apostle declares regarding the most horrible form of idolatry, the image cultus, self-evidently concerns also all finer forms of idolatry, such as the veneration of the sun, moon, and stars, or that of the powers of nature, concerns also the deification of the creature, as it is current in the present-day, so-called Christian world.

In short, powerful statements the Apostle has characterized the *ἀσέβεια*, the godlessness of men, and has shown how men through ungodliness suppress the truth. In the following he turns to the presentation of the other basic wrong, the *ἀδικία*, the unrighteousness.

1:24-27.

Here, in vv. 24-27, the Apostle sets forth the other basic evil and vice of the Gentiles, the *ἀκαθαρσία*, the uncleanness, here specially, as in 2 Cor 12:21; Ga 5:19, all sorts of sexual lewdness, "lewd filthiness." This belongs in the genus of *ἀδικία*. But he does not coordinate the *ἀκαθαρσία*, of the previously pictured *ἀσέβεια*, but expresses himself thus: "wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness" *Διὸ καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν*. Therefore, because of their godlessness and idolatry, God, in agreement with their conduct, has also delivered men to uncleanness. Uncleanness here appears as a punishment of godlessness and as a divine judgment. God punishes sin with sin. Of this the world also has some awareness. "That is the curse of the evil deed, that it must produce continued evil." To the *παρέδωκεν ὁ θεός* Calov remarks: Tradite sunt a deo non effective, nec solum permissive, nec tantum *ἐκ βατικῶς*, "sed δικαστικῶς" "et judicialiter". As true as this is, still the *παρέδωκεν* is not sufficiently explained. The concept of punishment and judgment already lies in the *διὸ καὶ*. The question is: Which special punitive judgment, which special act of God is meant by the "giving them up to uncleanness"? - a

question concerning which one finds little information in the commentaries. When, for example, Hofmann and Meyer explain this expression, that God permits the inner connection between sin and punishment to come to full reality, of which nothing is really said. On the other hand, when Luthardt advances the opinion that God works this especial form of sin, then too much is said, in that God works no evil at all. In order to understand the meaning of the Apostle, we must above all take into consideration the modifier ἐν ταῖς ἐπὶ θυμῷ αὐτῶν καρδίαις αὐτῶν "Through the lusts of their own hearts," in which they were engrossed, which they cherished and protected. God had given the Gentiles into uncleanness, into all the works of the flesh, in which the evil desires became deeds. Philippi remarks correctly: "The grasping and nourishing of sinful desires in their hearts, which had been established with the falling away from God and the "idolatrous surrender" of the creatures, is thus presented as their own act; on the other hand, the outbreak of these desires into disgraceful depravity, is a divine, punitive judgment. But wherein does this divine arrangement consist? First of all, God still has His work in fallen man, God also still holds sinful man with His Spirit, at least outwardly, in discipline and bounds, and instills in him fear and terror of sin. God warns one who hatches up evil plans against the actual sin, as He warned Cain before he became a murderer. He admonishes the conscience, lays all sorts of hindrances in the way of evil intentions, and thus seeks to check the outbreak or still the most horrible outbreaks of the evil desires of the heart. But when man despises all these divine admonitions and the godlessness increases, then God takes away His Spirit, then God withdraws all these bounds and hindrances, and gives up and delivers the godless man completely over to sin, so that nothing any longer stands in the way of the satisfaction of his desires. And so, in this sense, God has abandoned the Gentiles to uncleanness, as punishment for their godlessness, so that now without any restraint, boldly and unhindered, they satisfy their evil lust, so that the evil desires of their hearts work themselves out unchecked in every possible uncleanness and unchastity. "He has positively withdrawn His hand; He has ceased holding back the boat, which is carried away by the stream." (Godet). Ancient commentators, like Chrysostom and Theophylact, clarify the matter which is dealt with here by the example of a captain, who deserts his soldiers in battle and thereby abandons them to the enemy, or of a physician, who gives up a disobedient patient and has nothing more to do with him. That which the Apostle attests here does not contradict what he writes in Eph 4:19, namely, that the Gentiles have given themselves over to lasciviousness for the exercising of all uncleanness. (ἐαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν). That the Gentiles have surrendered themselves

willfully to the service of uncleanness does not exclude the fact that God has given them into the same. God has delivered them over to their own perverted mind and will. Moreover, that which Paul describes in here regarding the destiny which has befallen the Gentiles, even if it calls to mind the description of the obduracy in Ro 9-11, still is something entirely different from the real judgment of obduracy. The latter befalls the unbelievers, who have not been obedient to the Gospel of Christ, while here (chapter 1) it deals in the context of the opposition against the natural revelation of God, which does not exclude the later revelation of God in the Gospel.

The infinitive clause τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι "dishonor" etc., added to the principal clause αὐτοῦς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν God to immortality, does not serve as a modifier of the expression εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, for that is an independent concept, which needs no supplement; it rather gives the purpose of this act of God. The correct reading, also adopted by Hofmann and Weiss, can be τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἢ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, "in oneself" the latter especially not in the meaning of ἀλλήλους, "each other," which also in v. 27 ἐν ἑαυτοῖς does not signify.

It is to be translated thus:

A.V.: "to dishonor their own bodies between themselves." ἀτιμάζεσθαι, which is never used in the middle, fits here as a passive. Through the vice of unchastity the bodies of men are dishonored and shamed. And certainly in themselves, ἐν αὐτοῖς, like αὐτῶν, refers to the persons who are under discussion. The body appears here, as in 1 Th 4:4, as something which the human being, as the human I, has upon itself. With this body man himself is shamed, the unchastity takes away from him all the honor which he has as a creature of God. At this God aimed when He abandoned man to uncleanness. Because of their godlessness He would punish them by this, that He abandoned their bodies to shame and so robbed them of their created honor.

In v. 25 the Apostle returns to the motive, which determined the action of God mentioned in v. 24, in that he continues: "who changed the truth of God into a lie." The relative pronoun, οἷτινες, "who", quippe qui, contains a causal statement. After the nexus between godlessness and uncleanness had already been shown in v. 24 with διὸ καί, now the congruence between sin and punishment is brought out. Ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ "the truth of God" is, as ἡ ἀλήθεια in v. 18, the truth which is God Himself, the true God (1 Th 1:9). τὸ ψεῦδος designates τοὺς ψευδεῖς θεοὺς, as also in the Hebrew רִפְּשִׁי, "the lie," serves for the designation of the idols (Is 44:20; Jr 3:10; 13:25). Men have exchanged the true living God with the idols, which are falsely called gods. Pro vero Deo sumserunt

imaginarios (Grotius). And "worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator." The ἐσεβάσθησαν concerns the inward veneration in the mind the ἐλάτρευσαν points to the outward service, cultus, and sacrifice. Poor foolish mankind turned their whole heart and all their powers to their idols. They serve the creature, the κτίσις, παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, παρὰ as in Lk 18:11, in the exclusive sense, praeterito or neglecto creatore, passing by the Creator. They honor creature and not the Creator, - who alone deserves praise, honor, and veneration, "who is blessed forever. Amen." Thus the Apostle cries out in holy exultation of spirit, in that he enters into the fray for the honor of his God and Creator. Idolatry or deification of a creature is an abomination over which all righteous Christians, who know, fear and love God, correctly become angry and enraged. Thus men have also shamed God, in that they have degraded Him to a creature, and that avenges itself now by the fact that according to the judgment of God they shame themselves, their own bodies. Whoever takes away the honor due God, the Creator, loses and destroys thereby his own honor, his human honor, and sinks down to the level of an animal.

The following sentence in vv. 26-27 runs parallel to vv. 24-25. It is stated again in v. 26: "for this cause God gave them up", namely, because of their idolatry, which had been mentioned in v. 25. Still instead of εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν the Apostle now uses a stronger expression, namely, εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας " " God has given them shameful passions, which enslaved and ruled them. What kind of passions are meant is explained in the following, vv. 26b, 27. After the Apostle had previously spoken in general of the vice of unchastity, he now names a special species (kinds) of the same, the most horrible, offensive form of sensual uncleanness, as it was prevalent at his time especially in the Roman world. Their women, who are by nature designated as θήλειαι, have exchanged the natural use of their sex for an unnatural one, in that women commit prostitution with women. In like manner, however, even the men - οἱ ἄρσενες is likewise a designation of nature - have left the natural use of the women, have burned in their desire for one another, and men commit on men the known shame, τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην "shameless deed." Men and women have denied the natural relationship of the two sexes to one another, which had been established by creation and upon which the continuation of the human race depends, and turned the act of corresponding to that into an unnatural act. Fleshly lusts, when they have free rein, finally degenerate into the grossest monstrosities. With such unnatural lewdness, under which they were enslaved, men only received the due reward, which they deserve according to God's righteous recompense, τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν "the penalty", ἣν ἔδου. This is the corresponding punishment for their

error, πλάνη , that they have wandered away from God to the idols. Such perversion of the truth avenges itself on them. Idolatry as it is portrayed in v. 25, is not only a desecration of God, but also a horrible monstrosity. The boundary line between Creator and creature is completely shifted when the honor is taken away from the Creator and placed upon the creature. And on such unnaturalness in the religious area there follows, according to God's judgment unnaturalness in the moral area so that the creative difference between man and woman, which concerns the sexual is completely done away with, so that men and women are likewise completely divested of their nature.

1:28-32

With καί in v. 28 the Apostle introduces a new guilt of men, which again at the same time appears as a punishment inflicted upon them by God. Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν.

"And just as they did not try to recognize God, God, God abandoned them, to a worthless mind." Δοκιμάζειν means "prove, test, try," and then, as here and otherwise, e.g., 1 Th 2:4, "vouchsafe, value," "consider worthy." This corresponds to ἀδόκιμος, from δέχομαι, "not acceptable," "objectionable," "worthless, contemptible." (Cf. 1 Cor 9:27). Νοῦς is as much as "mind," "conviction"; it designates first of all the inner ability, "that by virtue of which man thinks and decides of himself, the thinking and willing in himself is his νοῦς." Delitzsch; but then also, as here and, for example, in 1 Cor 1:10; 2:16, the concrete thinking and willing as a skill, a certain direction of thought and will, the condition of the mind, attitude. Thus men have not considered God worthy of acknowledging him, ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει. God had given Himself to be known by them, they have known God, but the knowledge did not come to an inner possession. They have not made this knowledge their own subjectively, have not put it to use, have not considered it worth the trouble. And the punishment now corresponds to this sin. Just as they have not considered it worthy to acknowledge God, just as they have rejected God and the knowledge of God, so has God abandoned them to a worthless, reprobate mind, so that they now freely and unhindered conform to this perverted attitude, so that, as the exegetical infinitive clause ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα states, they now do what is not (μὴ) becoming according to their own judgment. With the knowledge of God there is also planted in the heart of man by nature a knowledge of good and evil; but also this moral knowledge men deny with their attitude and with their activity. But as the following shows, the Apostle has in mind here a special form of wrongdoing. There follow in vv. 29-31 only accusatives of participles, substantives, and adjectives, which belong to the

subject, to be supplied, thus to αὐτοῦς , the subject of ποιεῖν "to do" in v. 28. Paul describes the persons who do that which is not fitting, and exactly so, that he characterizes them according to their objectionable mind and activity. The common fact in the transgressions enumerated in the following index of sins is that thereby the neighbor is harmed, the love of the neighbor is abandoned. We can differentiate four groups of modifiers of αὐτοῦς . The first two groups are introduced by πεπληρωμένους "being filled" and μεστούς "full of." Men are full of every evil, there are not only isolated mistakes and vices, which adhere to them from the top of their head to their feet; there is nothing whole in them. Philippi correctly recalls the dictum of Seneca, de ira , II, 8, with which he begins the description of the moral depravity of his time: Omnia sceleribus ac vitiis plena sunt. The first series we read with Lachmann according to good authorities: πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ , "being filled with all unrighteousness," κακία , "malice," πονηρίᾳ , "wickedness," πλεονεξίᾳ , "covetousness." The reading πορνείᾳ , "fornication," which simply does not fit in this connection, is not genuine in any case and is really written as a mistake from πονηρίᾳ . Mankind is filled with all kinds of unrighteousness. Ἀδικία , here in the narrow sense, infraction of the rights of the neighbor, denial of righteousness which one owes to a neighbor (suum cuique), includes under it all the separate transgressions mentioned in the following. But also the two substantives immediately following, κακία and πονηρίᾳ , are still general concepts. We translate κακός and πονηρός into English somewhat with "evil" and "bad." Much has been written and conjectured concerning the differentiation of these two designations. Yet the idiom of the New Testament, as Weiss correctly calls our attention to the fact, suggests no certain difference. Only the following consideration could stand the test. Κακός is the nearest contrast ἀγαθός "good" or καλός "good or useful," ^{κακία} is the opposite of ἀρετή; πονηρός , πονηρίᾳ is the designation of the most intensive wickedness, therefore the devil is always called ὁ πονηρός "the wicked one." In the sense of moral wickedness, and depravity in general κακία and πονηρίᾳ are connected in 1 Cor 5,8. However, both concepts also specially designate the evil, wicked disposition over against the neighbor; thus κακία (Eph 4:31; Col 3:8; Tt 3:3; 1 Pe 2:1; Jas 1:21; πονηρίᾳ , Mk 7:22; Lk 11:39; Mt 22:18). And in this latter meaning both are found together in our passage; we translate, in that we maintain a gradatio, (A.V.: "wickedness"), and "malice," or "deceit." The πλεονεξία , "covetousness," which inconsiderately seeks its own advantage, to the disadvantage of the neighbor, appears also otherwise,

for example, Eph 5:3; 1 Th 4:3-5, together with the ἀκαθαρσία "immorality" as a basic vice of the Gentiles. In the second series there now follow special vices: individual demonstrations of unrighteousness and wickedness, and certainly such which flow from avarice, covetousness: μέστους, φθόνον, φόνου, ἔπιδος, δόλου, κακοηθείας, "full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity." Envy does not grant to another his own and often leads to the point that one puts him aside; or, if it does not come that far, then one begins debate and strife with him over what is mine or thine, or strives with deceit and malignity, in an indirect way, to do him injury. Κακοή-θεια means really morum perversitas, "evil character," then especially tricky and malicious nature. A third series of transgressions against the second table of the Law begins with the words ψιθυριστάς, καταλάλους, "whisperer," "tell-tale," and "slanderer." Men harm one another not only in body and life, property and goods, but also in their reputation. Closely bound together with one another are the three nouns ὕβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνας. The ὕβριστής is a wicked person, who in his arrogance treats his neighbor disgracefully, and mean. The ὑπερήφανος is one who raises his ego above all others and looks down disdainfully upon all others. The ἀλαζών, vaniloquus, gloriosus, is one who makes a parade of his own imaginary merits and deserts and will have nothing to do with another one. Such deep despising of one's fellow man, as if he were not our equal, such degradation of his person, is the most shameful thing that one can do to him. And such pride is an especial abomination before God. Therefore the Apostle here particularly draws attention to the fact that people of this stamp are hateful to God. For θεοστυγεῖς, "haters of God," which has only a passive meaning cannot mean osores Dei, is unsuitable to take an independent position in this index of sins and therefore must be connected as a preceding attribute with the following expressions. Men who are hateful to God and wicked, are transgressors, etc. And finally Paul calls them ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν "contrivers of evil." They are inventive, designing in evil; they always devise new tricks and schemes, which one cannot fully enumerate, to do injury to their fellowmen. A fourth series contains adjectives beginning with ἀ privativum, which further describes the objectionable disposition and the immoral action of men from the negative side. These are disobedient to parents, ἀσύνετοι, imprudent, will not let themselves be told anything, ἀσύνθετοι, unsociable, ἄστοργοι, loveless, suppress all natural affections of love, ἀνελεήγονες, unmerciful, insensible to the needs of their fellowmen. In short, they deny all reverence, all human feeling and sympathy, and have become true monsters. Just because they did not let God be their God. Only where God is acknowledged, feared,

and loved, will true humanity be found.

That God has abandoned men into a contemptible, objectionable way of thinking is proven by the special fact, which is introduced in v. 32 with οἱ αὐτοὶ "who" and is joined with the foregoing description of morals. Men have known the legal demand, the judgment of God, τὸ δικάσιμα τοῦ Θεοῦ . With the knowledge of God at the same time that which is right according to God's will and determination for the conduct of men over against one another has been inscribed in the heart. As God is righteous, just and benevolent over against men, His creatures, so should mankind show righteousness and love over against their equals. That they know very well, ἐπυγνόντες , and know also that "they which commit such things are worthy of death," that all who perform the previously mentioned evil works are not worthy of living. Because they destroy the peaceful living together of men with their evil activity and put an end to the continuation of the human race, as far as they are concerned, therefore they have no right to existence upon earth. Such knowledge manifests itself, for example, in the heathen myths, concerning the vengeance of the gods, who suddenly snatch away the evildoers, or concerning the punishment of the evil in Hades. The Apostle transposes the confused heathen ideas into the adequate truth, in that he speaks of death, temporal death, which, however, for sinful man is only the gateway to eternal death. It is entirely beside the point to think here with Hofmann of the death penalty to be carried out by the government. But now, even though men know that, they still do the opposite to that which is right, and not only that, but - and this is an intensification - they give approval, συνευδοκοῦσι , to those who as it were make a profession of those evil deeds τοὺς πράσσουσι . Thereby they show their pleasure in things which according to their own judgment are transgressions worthy of death. Very correctly several commentators here refer to the theoretical defense of "Paederastie," vengeance, and other vices in the writings of ancient heathen philosophers. Peius est συνευδοκεῖν ; nam qui malum patrat, sua sibi cupiditate abducitur etc; sed qui συνευδοκεῖ , corde et ore, malitiae fructum habet ipsam malitiam, eaque pascitur, et suum reatum alieno cumalat aliosque in peccando inflammat. Pejor est, qui et se et alios, quam qui se unum perimit. Bengel.

The Apostle has carried through from all points of view the theme of the section, vv. 18-32, which had been introduced in v. 18. He has pointed to the three basic wrongs of humanity, of heathenism. Men have robbed God of His glory and conferred it upon the creatures. They serve uncleanness and unchastity, shame their own and one another's bodies, in that they pervert the natural relationship of man to woman. They deny all righteousness and love over against their fellowmen. And

the two latter transgressions, which are included under the concept ἀδικία "unrighteousness" in the wider sense, are the result and punishment of the first concept, ἀσέβεια "impiety." And in that they suppress the truth through godlessness and unrighteousness, which has become manifest to them, they are inexcusable and the children of wrath. But it is well to consider that in this manner the Apostle does not only portray barbarism; no, he describes here the world which he has before his eyes, the Roman-Greek world of culture. The high degree of culture which the world had attained in his day contained in itself such a deep moral corruption. With all the outward splendor and brilliance everything was inwardly rotten and foul, full of decay and the smell of death.

In the foregoing section Paul speaks of man in general, of natural mankind which is estranged from God. Therefore this moral description of his applies also to the generation of our day. One cannot better characterize the religious-moral condition of the world, which we have before our eyes, and especially of the civilized world, than with these words of the Apostle. It is an idolatrous generation, a generation forgetful of God, which dwells here upon the earth. Who still thanks God for His goodness, to which he owes life and well-being? The religion, that is, the pseudo-religion of the world is the deification of the creature. The world idolizes its great ones, its heroes. They idolize themselves their own power, wisdom, ability, their own accomplishments and achievements. Even the philosophical opinion of God and the veneration of God is nothing else than the transformation of God into the image of a weak, mortal man. Man measures God and divine things according to human standards. The generation of this time is an adulterous generation. That whereon the world feeds and indulges itself is the desire of the flesh, the lust of the eye, shame and uncleanness. The fleshly desires of lustful men are no longer satisfied by common whoredom, but yearn for extraordinary, refined desire and satisfaction. The unnaturalness, the unnatural unchastity has only taken on a different form and manner than at the time of the Apostle. It is a murderous generation among whom we live. Avarice, insatiable greed, which knows no consideration (of others), is the mainspring of business life. There is no "live and let live." Everyone seeks to rise in the world, by ruining and trampling others. It is vain scorn and derision when the world writes humanitarianism and general love of mankind upon its banner. And this stream of corruption flows irresistibly onward. One can no longer check and hinder this disgraceful state of affairs. All attempts at reform are a blow on the water. Mankind is bound to unrighteousness as with iron chains. Where does it come from? It is a judgment which holds sway over the actions and movements of the children of men.

God has given them over to this perverted mind. The consciousness of God and morality are still not completely extinguished in this degenerate generation. One still perceives voices which bear witness of what is right before God and man. But what there is still present of truth serves only to call for the opposition, to prod man on to do the opposite of what is right. And therefore men have no excuse. And so the world pushes on irresistibly to the abyss, to the day of the wrath and righteous judgment of God.

Finally we can put together the content of this first doctrinal presentation of our Letter, 1:18-32, in the following summary:

God's wrath from heaven is manifest over all the ungodlessness and unrighteousness of mankind, who have denied the true, living God, who has given Himself to be known by them, and therefore according to God's righteous judgment they shame their own bodies in horrible unchastity and do harm and shame to one another, who sin and do wrong against their own nature, against their own feelings and better consciences, and therefore they have no excuse.

CHAPTER 2

Chapter 2:1-5 Correct Judgment in Itself Does Not Excuse, But Only Increases the Guilt

The Apostle has uncovered the deep moral depravity of the heathen world. Now he takes one man out of the multitude and says to him: "Therefore you are without excuse, O man." This one man, as the addition $\pi\alpha\varsigma \delta \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\nu$, "whosoever thou art that judgest," shows, represents an entire class of men. With such men who make a Profession of Judging the Apostle now enters into judgment. They judge and pass judgment on others and take credit for their own superiority. These people with whom Paul deals here criticize and judge others because of their evil works. But a man who condemns another is without excuse, as 1:20 has shown. With the , "therefore," the Apostle points back to the immediately preceding expression, 1:32. There it was emphasized that men, even though they know the legal statute of God, still commit the previously mentioned evil things; yes, they even give approval to the evildoers. Whoever sins and commits a crime against better knowledge and conscience has no excuse. Therefore each one is inexcusable who judges another. In what respect this is so is explained by the two following statements which are introduced by $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$. "For in that you judge another, you condemn yourself; for you who judge practice the same things." We take the $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tilde{\varphi}$ in the sense of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron$, $\delta\tilde{\omicron}\tau\iota$, not in the sense of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tilde{\varphi}$, "in this in which," for then one would expect the plural $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ corresponding to the following $\tau\acute{\alpha} \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$, "the same things." Such a man who judges against another, judges himself, because he himself commits the very thing which he criticizes in another. So he has no excuse in that by his action he not only denies his own better knowledge, but the moral judgment which he has expressly declared is against himself. The Apostle differentiates between three classes of unrighteous. The one serves uncleanness and unrighteousness, with injury to his conscience. He does not think of excusing and justifying his evil deeds. The second group does the same, but these defend, gloss over, and even praise what they well know is objectionable and worthy of death (1:32). But there is still a third class of men who criticize and judge evil, but only in others, not in themselves. They

themselves boldly do that for which they criticize and reproach others, and therewith they appease their conscience; they still possess and express the righteous judgment. Of these the third class are the worst (2:1). One could here raise the question, whether such deluded men really exist. Yes, the Apostle's portrayal of morals corresponds exactly to the facts. Such foul, sanctimonious moralists still judge; they fly into a fit of anger over others while they are guilty themselves. So perverted is the human heart that it convinces itself and finally also believes that the correct knowledge, speech, and judgment make up for and make good the perverted behavior. Of this kind are mostly people whom the world admires and highly praises as heroes of virtue and prophets of morality.

As in the previous section the two points were called to our attention, that mankind is without excuse and that it has fallen under wrath, so here also to the ἀναπολόγητος εἶ , "you are without excuse," there is added the reference to the future judgment. Thus the Apostle testifies in the name of all Christians. "And we know that the judgment of God rightly falls upon those who practice such things." In any case δέ , which is to be taken as the metabatic de, and ^{not} γάρ , is the better reading. Τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ is the final, deciding judgment of God, which God delivers on the day of judgment, according to the context (v. 5). This judgment passes upon those who commit the evil things which are enumerated in the preceding section. Whoever does evil shall be under God's judgment, even though he criticizes the evil in others. The modifier κατὰ ἀλήθειαν , that is, "according to the truth," is similar to ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (Mt 22:16); ἐπὶ ἀληθείας (Mk 12:14), not "according to the measure of truth," and it strengthens this expression and stands against an erroneous presentation of man, with which the Apostle proceeds in the following.

"And do you suppose this, O man, when you pass judgment upon those who practice such things and do the same yourself, that you will escape the judgment of God?" (v. 3). With , the delusion of the men who judge these things is placed over against the previously expressed apostolic statement. The verb λογίζεσθαι means really censere, "judge," but then also, as here, opinare, "think, suppose." Every moralizer presumes that he for his own person - the σὺ is stressed - shall escape the condemning judgment of God, and that God shall guard him from the future wrath. But now the Apostle places the question before him and thereby appeals to his conscience: Do you really think that? Does this thought of yours stand the test? It should not be too difficult to recognize that this is a vain hope, that one cannot stand before God with such a glaring contradiction between speech and action.

With an η , which is common in a double question, the Apostle in v. 4 introduces a second question and thereby encounters another perverted notion. "Or do you think lightly of the riches of His kindness and forbearance and patience, not knowing that the kindness of God leads you to repentance?" The persons with whom Paul deals here appeal somewhat to the fact that for the present it still goes well with them and from that they draw the conclusion that God has nothing against them. Yes, in time God certainly shows to sinners the richness of His goodness, overwhelms them with benefits of all kinds. He causes His sun to rise daily on the good and the evil and permits rain to fall on the just and the unjust. And He is patient and longsuffering above measure, endures ($\acute{\alpha}\nuοχ\eta\varsigma$) the offenses which men commit against Him, and postpones the punishment. But what is God's purpose in this goodness? It leads the sinner to repentance, $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nuο\iota\alpha\nu\ \sigma\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, "He leads you to repentance." That really takes place a parte Dei (from God's side). As the truth which was manifested in the works of creation urges and obligates men to give God the honor and to live to His pleasure, so the rich kindness of God, which sinful men enjoy in this time of divine forbearance and longsuffering, includes in itself the constraint and the impulse to repentance. Still, how do men, and namely mankind in general, accept such favor of God? As they suppress the truth by unrighteousness, they fail to appreciate, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\nuο\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ (to be unaware), they would know nothing of the fact that the goodness of God leads them to repentance. They despise the riches of the divine goodness, forbearance and longsuffering, forcefully stifle the impression which God's favors make upon the heart and conscience. Thus finally the experience of the divine goodness must serve for the purpose of making men inexcusable. Only those who have led to repentance and are really converted by the one means of grace and salvation, through God's Word and Spirit, have their hearts opened to the sunshine of divine goodness and love with which they are surrounded. They accept the patience and longsuffering of God truly for their own improvement, for the salvation of their souls. In particular, however, such a man who judges others but not himself proves himself to be a despiser of the divine goodness, patience, and longsuffering. And now the Apostle questions him, and even this question is an appeal to his conscience. How? You despise the riches of the divine goodness, etc.? You dare to defy the great, all-bountiful, patient, longsuffering God?

With an affirmative statement he concludes his description of the man who judges: "But because of your stubbornness and unrepentant heart you are storing up wrath for yourself in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (v. 5). The man who himself does the evil which he criticizes in others,

"neither lets himself be frightened by the judgment of God, which threatens in the future, nor be moved by God's goodness, which he experiences in the present" (Hofmann). Instead of repenting, he much rather (δέ) heaps up for himself wrath, according to the stubbornness and hardness of his heart (σκληρότητα), and thus rejects every effect of the goodness of God. He heaps sin upon sin, misuses the right gifts of the divine goodness for the satisfaction of his fleshly lusts, spends the time of divine patience and longsuffering for evil-doing, and in this manner heaps wrath upon himself. While God shows him the riches of His goodness, forbearance, and longsuffering, he gathers for himself an evil treasure of wrath (θησαυρίζεις). This wrath bursts upon him when God's goodness gives place to wrath on the day when the righteous judgment of God shall be revealed to all men.

Summary of this section, 2:1-5: Those who not only sin against better knowledge, but even judge others and still do the same things which they criticize in others, are inexcusable above others and shall least of all escape the future wrath.

2:6-16 The Impartial Judgment of God

2:6-10

"Who will render to every man according to his deeds" (v. 6). Precisely in this section God's righteousness shows itself in judgment. Paul loves to join a self-evident, important thought to the foregoing statement by means of a relative. We can also translate thus: "And He, namely God, shall render to every man according to his deeds." This statement is carried out further in utramque partem (in both directions), i.e., toward the good and the evil works. It reads in v. 7: τοὺς μέν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι ζωὴν αἰώνιον, "to those who by perseverance in doing good seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." The predicate ἀποδώσει, "he will render," self-evidently applies also to this modifier in v. 6. But the question is: Which one or which ones of the accusatives designated here belong to this predicate as object? The preceding words are variously construed by the expositors. Most of them (e.g. Meyer, Weiss, Philippi, Godet, Luthardt and also some ancient ones) take τοὺς ζητοῦσι as one expression and then, letting ζωὴν αἰώνιον depend on ἀποδώσει, translate thus: "those who in good works patiently strive for glory, honor, and the incorruptible life He will reward with eternal life." And as in the parallel statement in v. 10 δόξα καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη, "glory and honor and peace," so evidently here in v. 7 δόξα καὶ τιμὴ καὶ ἀφθαρσία serves to

designate that which shall fall to man's lot from God on that day. And καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ corresponds obviously to the κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, "according to his deeds," v. 6, and thus designates the standard of the divine reward, not the norm of the human striving. One can hardly imagine how the striving for eternal life should be ruled through works. The latter argument also speaks against the combination of καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ in itself alone with τοὺς μὲν, as is advocated by Bengel and others, in the sense of "those who are characterized by perseverance in good works." The connection of the article with a substantive ruled by κατὰ is otherwise demonstrable. The Greek may say οἱ ἐξ ἔργων, "those who are of works," but not οἱ κατὰ ἔργα, "those who are according to works," and the like. Therefore with Hofmann we take τοὺς μὲν as an independent expression, δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν as object to ἀποδώσει, ζωὴν αἰώνιου as object to ζητοῦσι, and understand the Apostolic statement thus: God shall recompense one with glory and honor and incorruptible life in conformity with their perseverance in good works, in that they seek eternal life. That no simple τοὺς δέ v. 8, corresponds to the τοὺς μὲν v. 7, does not stand in the way of this explanation, since the reverse side in v. 8 is formulated in an entirely different manner. And if the last words, ζητοῦσι ζωὴν αἰώνιον, give a passive sense, then one cannot say that they tediously hobble along behind our interpretation. Thus God, who on that day shall reward everyone according to his works, shall recompense good to the individuals according to their good works. Meanwhile, Paul does not write κατ' ἔργα ἀγαθὰ, "according to good works," but καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ, in that with the singular he designates the collective uniform works of life as a good work. He draws attention to the fact that those concerned continue in good works to the end. In conformity with such good works God shall in the future acknowledge them and give to them δόξαν, "glory"; the righteous shall shine as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father, Mt. 13:43; τιμὴν, "honor," we shall rule with Christ, Tm 2:12; incorruptible essence, the pure, unspotted and therefore unfading and incorruptible possession of the future world (cf. 1 Pe 1:14). Those are three leading features of eternal life. The people under discussion here seek eternal life, and earnestly strive to become blessed, as is proven by their zeal in doing good. Thus they also finally find what they are seeking. The adverse, concerning those who do evil, the Apostle does not introduce into the structure of the previous sentence (vv. 6-7), but gives that in an independent treatment in that he continues: τοὺς δὲ ἐξ ἐπιθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένους δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή.

"but to those who are selfishly ambitious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, wrath, and indignation" (v. 8). Οὐ ἐξ ἐπιθείας, to be sure, is a genuine Greek manner of speech, corresponding to ὁ ἐκ πίστεως, οὐ ἐκ περιτομῆς, ὁ ἐκ νόμου, "one who has faith," "those of the circumcision," "those who are of the Law" (Ro 3:26; 4:12-14). Those are meant whose moral disposition and frame of mind flow from the ἐπίθετα. Ἐπίθετα is derived from ἐπιθος, "wage earner," and means greed or bribery. It also means more generally, self-interest, selfishness, wilfulness, not however, as it is commonly understood, factionalism or spirit of intrigue and love of dispute. In his dictionary of New Testament Greek Grammar has proven this from the profane Greek use of language. The more general meaning fits also in all the New Testament passages in which the word is found, Ga 5:20; 2 Cor 12:20; Php 1:16; Jas 3:14.16. In our passage οὐ ἐξ ἐπιθείας are these self-willed ones, who everywhere "prove their evil Ego" (Hofmann), and who therefore do not obey the truth which is contrary to their perverted self, but much rather obey the unrighteousness which is inwardly like them and is therefore agreeable. Here the truth in the moral sphere is meant similarly as in Eph 4:21; 6:14, that which is the Law and God's will regarding the conduct of man. To those who are thus minded and disposed and thus serve unrighteousness fury and wrath shall be shown on that day: θυμός, "act of boiling up," excandescencia, strengthens the concept ὀργά.

The double recompense is repeated in vv. 9.10, only in an inverted, "chiastic" order. "Tribulation and distress for every soul of man who does evil." The fury and wrath of God brings upon the evildoer "Truebsal und Angst" (affliction and anxiety), as Luther has well translated into the German, really "Drangsals und Bedrängnis" (oppression and distress). The στενοχωρία is the most extreme degree of θλίψις, as one sees from 2 Cor 4:8: ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι "we are troubled on every side, yet not distressed." The godless do not know what to do on the day of judgment; they do not know where to go in or out. "Whither shall I flee?" Both, θλίψις, "affliction," and στενοχωρία, "distress," concern the entire man, according to body and soul. Such severe distress - ἔσται is to be supplied - shall come over that soul of man which performs the evil, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου, "for every soul of man," which means according to the analogy of the Hebrew **עַל כָּל נַפְשׁוֹת**, over every individual person. Cf. Ro 13:11: Πᾶσα ψυχὴ, ("Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers") etc. ("But glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good"). Instead of ἀφθαρσία "incorruptibility" it here reads εἰρήνη, "peace" which is as much as the Hebrew **שְׁלוֹמָא**, "salvation," complete salvation, perfect welfare and

well-being. The activity of the evil ones is designated in v. 9 with κατεργάζεσθαι , "to achieve," the activity of the good in v. 10 with the simple ἐργάζεσθαι , "to work"; "for man goes farther in evil than in good" (Luthardt). But to both of the statements the Apostle still adds the remark that what he says here applies to the Jews and Greeks, namely to the Jews in particular; to the first sentence Ἰουδαίου τε πρώτον καὶ Ἕλληνας , "of the Jew first and also of the Greek." and to the second Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτον καὶ Ἕλληνι , "to the Jew first and also to the Greek." The reward of God is general and it concerns Jews and Greeks, both the reward of the evil and of the good. Still the Jews here also have a prerogative over the Gentiles. To the Jews God especially revealed Himself. They have the Law and promises, for the Gospel was preached to them first of all, 1:16. They shall also take precedence in the judgment of God; they are the first and closest objects of the divine judging.

Thus in this section, 2:6-10, the Apostle teaches a reward according to works, according to good works as well as to evil works. The statement that the wrath and terror of God shall befall the evildoers is nothing extraordinary. But some have taken offense in the other statement, that God shall reward those with eternal life who do good according to their perseverance in good works. Fritzsche judges very naively that the Apostle here went too far in his zeal about good works and has fallen into contradiction with himself, in that what he writes here does not agree with 3:20 and in general not with his doctrine of justification. After the example of Melancthon and Flacius the later Lutheran theologians for the most part, in order to avoid this difficulty and exclude papistic deductions, have designated the preceding apostolic declaration as a phrasis legalis (legal phrase) or a sententia legalis (legal phrase) or a sententia legalis (legal opinion). They suppose that Paul speaks here from the standpoint of the Law, which is corrected by the Gospel, or he speaks conditionaliter (conditionally). If there were such men, of which there are none, who only do good unto the end and fulfill the Law perfectly, then God would reward them with eternal life for their good works. But the future, ἀποδώσει , "he will reward," is, to speak with Godet, "not a conditional form." The Apostle here speaks apodictically of that which shall actually take place on the day of judgment. As here the Scripture speaks in many passages concerning the future reward. In Ps 62:13 it reads according to the Septuagint: ὅτι σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ , "for you will recompense every one according to his works"; Pr 24:12: ὅς ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ , "who renders to every man according to his works." Christ says in Mt 16:27: "For the Son of man shall come in His glory . . . and then He shall reward every man according to his works," καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν κρᾶσιν αὐτοῦ . Similarly in John 5:29: "And shall come forth; they that

have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Paul writes in 2 Cor 5:10: "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (Cf. Ga 6:7-9; Eph 6:8; Col 3:2. In the Revelation of St. John the Lord announces: "And I will give unto everyone of you according to your works" (Re 2:23). And in Re 20:12 we read: "And the dead were judged. . . according to their works." All these are evidently not hypothetical but categorical statements. The Lord and certainly also Christ the Lord shall actually on the Last Day reward everyone according to his works, according to that which he has done in his life, whether it be good or bad. The works of men appear throughout Scripture as the actual norm of the judgment. The only question is, how is this to be understood, especially with regard to the good works? It is to be remembered especially that the concept of the norm does not necessarily include the concept of merit. As the Scriptures otherwise testify, e.g., Ro 6:23, the godless with their evil works indeed deserve hell, but contrariwise the devout do not deserve salvation with their good works. To be sure, everything that we do and suffer here below in love to God and Christ shall be recompensed in heaven, and we can also say: we shall be well rewarded (Mt 5:12). But, as Calvin correctly remarks, Stulta consequentia est, ex mercede statuere meritum. On the other hand, the κατά in κατά τὰ ἔργα in no way says that which God rewards and gives must always correspond exactly to the measure and worth of that which man has done. Death, wrath and condemnation is really the adequate punishment for the evil actions of men. On the other hand, it is the prerogative of the judge how high he will set the reward for good works, and it does not contradict justice, when he here permits his goodness to reign and also richly and abundantly rewards simple works. We know that the reward of God, the reward of eternity, shall far surpass our works. Calov remarks according to Grotius: Hoc interest, quod poena non potest per justitiam excedere mensuram criminis; praemium autem, si accedat dantis liberalitas, potest esse majus, quam quantum facta per se valeant. Reward according to the standard of works signifies in itself nothing else, nothing more and nothing less, than that God repays good with good, evil with evil. Bonis factis bona malis factis mala Deus reddet. This is certainly a proof of divine justice (Cf. 2 Th 1:5.6). But we must still go a step further and consider more directly who the persons are who do good and who do evil, and whom Paul has in mind in our passage and which the Scriptures have in mind in the cited parallel passages. Christ Himself gives us more exact information as to how He means it, when He says that everyone shall be rewarded

according to his works in that solemn description of the final judgment (Mt 25: 31-46). When the Son of man shall come in His glory and shall sit upon the judgment throne, then He will welcome, praise and lead with Himself into eternal life those who have exercised themselves in works of mercy, in good works in general. But He shall cast from Himself, shall cast into everlasting fire, those who have done no good but only evil. Those who stand at His right hand and have done good are like the sheep which are sheep of His fold, His believers; the others who stand at His left hand and have done evil works are like the goats, that is, those who have been hostile to and alienated from Christ, the unbelievers. What decides regarding salvation and condemnation, is faith or unbelief. But faith necessarily brings forth good fruits, proves itself outwardly before men in all sorts of good works, while the unbelievers remain and live in their sins and serve unrighteousness. And so in the public transaction of the final judgment, the Lord shall prove the faith of His own from their works and thus vindicate His decision before the whole world. He shall at the same time reward the good works, the works of faith of His own, with eternal life, which He gives to the believer by grace. The unbelievers who have lived and died in their sins shall receive the deserved reward of their evil works in eternal torment. Thus, that which Paul in the foregoing section and the Scriptures in general teach concerning the reward of works, especially of good works, agrees very well with that which Paul otherwise and the Scriptures in general teach concerning the cause of salvation and condemnation.

One might still take into consideration that according to the Scriptures faith and all the good works of the believers are the work and effect of divine grace. God in and with the rewarding of the good works only crowns His own work. The explanation of the apostolic statement, 2:6-10, which is given here, not only finds its advocates among the modern expositors, for example, Philippi and Luthardt, but can also be designated as genuinely Lutheran. Koerner, the co-author of the Formula of Concord, in his commentary on the Letter to the Romans gives his exegesis on the words of Paul in the following manner:

The opinion is this that God will grant blessings to the just but inflict punishment on the unjust. Who the just are is to be explained from the Gospel, for the just are those justified by faith, who believe in the Son of God and thereby yield good fruits of the Spirit, namely good works. The unjust and the damned are those who do not believe. Since their works are evil, they merit eternal punishment. But to the just God gives eternal life, not on account of their works but for the sake of the mediator Christ, in whom they believe. Their works he commends and adorns with rewards because they are of God and done in faith. Those who are evil God afflicts with punishments because they lack faith.

The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, in the Third Article (See Mueller, S.B.S., p. 148) [See Triglotta, pp. 218-220] lets itself be understood thus on this treatment:

But the Scriptures call eternal life a reward, not because God is obligated to give eternal life for the sake of works, but eternal life will otherwise be given for other reasons. Just as the inheritance and all possessions of a father are given to the son, as a rich compensation and reward for his obedience, and yet the son receives the inheritance, not on account of his merit, but because the father, for the reason that he is his father, wants him to have it. This is sufficient reason why eternal life is called a reward, because thereby the tribulations which we suffer, and the works of love which we do, are compensated, although we have not deserved it. There are two kinds of compensation: one, which is owed, the other, which is not owed, to render. E.g., when the emperor grants a servant a principality, he therewith compensates the servant's work. Yet the work is not worth the principality, but the servant acknowledges that he has received a gracious gift. Thus God does not owe us eternal life, still, when He grants it to believers for Christ's sake, that is a compensation for our sufferings and works.

(See Triglotta, pp. 218-220.) The Apology there adds that the statement in Ro 2:6ff. is also to be understood according to this rule. It is well to consider that our Confession here, exactly as Paul in 2:7 and 2:10, designates eternal life itself, not only special gifts and grades of glory, as a reward and recompense of good works. Even the later dogmaticians and exegetes, after they have tired themselves out to gain a hypothetical connotation from the simple wording of the text, finally return to the right track and place the correct exegesis beside the untenable interpretation, often without explanation. Almost all of them remark that the good works, which God shall reward, come into consideration as signa et testimonia fidei salvificae. Calov writes (German text):

The reward ἀποδοσὺς is according to the works (this is actually done), but but not according to the merit of the works, not on account of the works. For even though retribution is due for evil works, for which we are worthy of death by force of divine justice, Ro 1:32; 6:23; nevertheless good works do not merit life. . . . When he (the apostle) says that God will reward according to works, - as our theologians rightly observe against the Pontifical theologians, - it is one thing to reward according to works, i.e., according to the testimony of works, which give testimony of interior faith or unbelief; it is another thing to reward on account of works, i.e., on account of the merit of works. . . . They also rightly remark that nowhere does it say διὰ τὰ ἔργα on account of the works, but κατὰ τὰ ἔργα, according to the works, because the works were the manifest rule of correct judgment δικαιοκρατίας, not however the norm of the proportion of merits. Our theologians observe with equal propriety that the Sacred Scriptures do not use the word ἀντιδόσεως, which from a certain point of view can properly speaking be applied to reward, but ἀποδόσεως, which is general and is applicable also when God by his grace crowns not our merits but his gifts.

And in Gerhard, Loci theol. XVIII, C. 8. Par. 116 we read: "By this faith we thereafter do good works and demonstrate that we are truly dwelling in Christ. By these works as on the way, marching toward the ultimate possession of eternal life, we pursue it finally by grace through faith. In this sense also ζητεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ ὑπομονὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ, to seek the glory and immortality by perseverance in doing what is right," is to be understood when referring to those born again. Thus good works are "the way of the kingdom, not the cause (basis) for reigning," as Bernhard says. Again, par. 114: We concede that a reward (of grace) is given for works; we deny that it is given on account of works. We concede that works are required as a condition for reward, but we deny that works intercede as a causality.

Even if Gerhard construes the words in 2:7 other than we have done, he still refers the words of the Apostle rightly to the believers, and to that which they shall truly receive on the day of judgment.

One thing more we have to remark concerning the nexus rerum (thought context). Many commentators draw attention to this, that Paul in the first principal part of this Letter, 1:18-3:20, describes the moral condition of mankind, Gentiles and Jews, prior and apart from the redemption through Christ. But now with this presentation in 2:5 he has come to speak of the final judgment and remains with this theme, 2:6-16. And there he evidently presupposes as well known to the Christians that which precedes the end and the final judgment, the redemption through Christ. Thus the fact that only through the Gospel or through faith in Christ God makes men fit for and capable of good works. He does not venture further to prove how men come to good works. However, he brings out the righteousness of the divine wrath which reaches out to the evil and the good, and he points simply to the fact that there are people who truly do good and continue therein unto the end. But when one raises the question, which one cannot completely dismiss: What kind of people are they who do good?, then the answer is to be taken out of the context of Christian doctrine; qui vero iusti sint, ex evangelio explicandum est, (who indeed are justified must be explained from the Gospel, Koermer).

2:11-16.

The Apostle has called attention to the fact that God, when He rewards everyone according to his works, makes no difference between Jews and Gentiles. And precisely this equalization of the Jews with the Gentiles he establishes now in v. 11 with the general statement that with God there is no respect of persons. The expression πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, from which προσωποληψία is derived, corresponds to the Hebrew פָּנִים אֲשֶׁר וְיִשָּׁר and signifies "To accept or look upon the face or person," "favor, patronize." In the New Testament it is used only malo sensu (in an evil sense), of favoritism, which allows itself to be determined

and corrupted by the outward appearance. God would be partial if He would permit Himself to be influenced in His judgment by the outward prerogatives which the Jews had over the Gentiles. But this is not the case. The following double sentence in v. 12 demonstrates in a special sense the impartiality of God. As many as have sinned without the Law, *ἀνόμως*, that is, without being in possession of a positive Law, the Gentiles are evidently meant. They will be last without the law, without being judged according to the norm of a specific law. Paul writes ἡμαρτον, "as many as have sinned," speaking from the viewpoint of the last judgment from which he looks back. The καί before ἀπολοῦνται indicates that the future destiny of these lawless persons shall correspond to their transgressions. As many as have sinned with the Law, that is, have sinned in the possession of a positive Law, and that applies to the Jews, shall be judged and convicted by the Law, according to the norm of their Law. For the κρίνεται evidently means a condemning judgment. While one takes ἐν νόμῳ, corresponding to the ἀνόμως, best as an adverbial modifier, with διὰ νόμον, "on account law," there is a pointing to the specific Law of the Jews. The νόμος without the article very often designates this concrete thing, the Mosaic Law. Thus whether with or without the possession of the Law, whether Gentile or Jew, the sinner falls under the judgment of God. The prerogative of the Jews over the Gentiles, that the Jews have received the revealed and written Law, shall in no way remove them from the judgment of condemnation of God, if they have transgressed the Law. The transgressors of the Law shall rather be judged and condemned by the Law. The latter expression, v. 12b, is now confirmed again in v. 13, with a general statement, namely that with God it does not depend on the hearing, but on the doing of the Law. The Apostle here speaks of the hearers of the Law, because among the Jews the possession of the Law is proven by the fact that they hear the Law read in their assemblies in the synagogue every Sabbath. They took pride in this hearing of the Law. But those who only hear the Law are not justified before God, according to God's judgment, because of their mere hearing. Rather, only the doers of the Law are justified. The δικαιοῦσθαι is here evidently meant as actus forensis (a forensic action), corresponding to the Hebrew *פָּדָה*.

It is a general principle which the Apostle presents in v. 13. And so one usually takes the δικαιοθήσονται as the future of logical result and translates it with the present. One notes that the foregoing statement of Paul contains only an abstract rule, hypothetical speech. If a man would really keep the Law, that is, would fulfill it completely and fully, then he would also be regarded by God as righteous. But there are no such men, and so, because no flesh shall be justified

by the works of the Law, righteousness comes by faith. But the question arises, whether such considerations are in place here. It must first be remembered that the Apostle in our passage does not compare, as in Ro 10:5ff.; Ga 3:11.12, the righteousness from the Law, which bases itself upon the doing of the Law, with the righteousness of faith. The passage only calls attention to the contrast between hearing and doing of the Law, and it only emphasizes that God judges a man not according to his hearing but according to his doing of the Law. Here the discussion does not in particular concern the solemn justification and the modus justificationis (mode of justification). The cardinal question, how the sinner is justified before God or can stand before God, how the sinner gains the judgment of God for himself or how he gains a gracious God, is treated later, from 3:21 on. One might consider further that the Apostle otherwise speaks of men who actually fulfill the Law and observe its legal demands (cf. 8:4; 2:26.27). He means the Christians described in 2:29 who have the Holy Spirit (8:2). The believing Christians appear in the Scriptures as ποιηταὶ νόμου, "doers of the law." The believers walk in the Commandments of God, and they are also obedient to the Law of God from the heart. They love God and they show this love to God by keeping His Commandments. Even if they do not fulfill the Law of God completely still their defects are covered with the perfect righteousness of Christ. And this interpretation of the concept "doers of the law," is also indicated in our passage by the context. The doers of the Law are evidently identical with the persons of whom the Apostle had already spoken previously, 2:7-10, who do good and who continue in good works unto the end. Thus also Philippi remarks on our verse, that in the power of justifying grace the ποιεῖν of the νόμος is certainly possible. But if the believers are de facto doers of the Law, then they shall also be recognized as such by God. And basically the Greek in this text does not intend to say anymore. Yet it does not read δικαιοῦνται, "they are being justified," but δικαιοθήσονται, "will be justified." Finally regarding this future, one can hardly resist the impression, to which also Klostermann calls attention, that this lies on the same level with the other futures of this context, that it points to the final judgment. Thus with ἀποδώσει, "he will render," v. 6, ἀπολοῦνται, "they will perish," and κριθήσονται, "will be judged," v. 12, and κρινεῖ, "he will judge," v. 16, and it designates something which shall really happen on the day of judgment. Certainly one dare not exploit this future in the manner as, for example, Godet does. He writes: "The imputed righteousness is the beginning of the work of salvation, the means of entering into the condition of grace. But this initial righteousness, in that it reinstates the communion between God and man, must lead the latter to the

actual possession of righteousness, that is, to the fulfillment of the Law; otherwise the first righteousness would not stand in the judgment. For that very reason, that which an antinomian, unwholesome tendency also might assert, corresponds to the thought of the Apostle to distinguish a twofold justification, the initial based exclusively on faith, and the final, based on faith and its fruits." Such exegesis directly contradicts the Pauline doctrine of justification, and is in no way demanded by the reading of the text. Even if one understood the *δικαιωθήσονται* in our passage concerning the justification *κατεροχθήν*, "most excellently," there would still not be taught a justification by works, on the basis of the fruits of faith. It is two different matters, whether one says that the doers of the Law, even these persons, are justified, or whether it is said that those concerned are justified for the works' sake. It is faith alone which places us into the right position, into the correct relationship with God. That which covers and protects the sinner before the countenance of the holy God, already now and also finally in the last judgment, that which makes him just before God in the solemn sense of the word, in time and in eternity, is only the blood and righteousness of Christ, which he grasps in faith, to the exclusion of all works. Whoever has become justified through Christ and through faith in Christ then also shows his faith in good works, or, what is the same, in the fulfillment of the Law, since real faith is a living and active thing. And on that day Christ, the Lord, as He Himself has taught in Mt 25:31ff., shall praise His believers, because they have exercised mercy, have served Him in the least of the brethren, and thus have fulfilled the principal law of love. He shall prove their faith by their works and shall pronounce, acknowledge and present them thus before the world as righteous ones, *δικαίους*, Mt 25:37.46, while the others who are destitute of such works He shall condemn. "There He shall then pronounce the judgment . . . and it sounds strange, that He places upon this and places at the base and reason for the same, that they have done or not done these works, as He relates them here, . . . and afterward the judgment shall fall on both groups, who have done or not done such works, as public testimony of the fruit of their faith or their unbelief" (Luther, Kirchenpostille). And to just this public judgment of the last day we now also point the *δικαιωθήσονται* in our passage. That twofold recompense, which is spoken of in 2:6-10, shall be preceded by a double judgment of the Judge, a condemning, (*κρίθησονται*, v. 12) which concerns the transgressors of the Law, and an acquitting, acknowledging sentence, which is imparted to the doers of the Law (v. 13). Here in vv. 12.13 a similar contrast, *κρίθησονται* . . . *δικαιωθήσονται* "they shall be judged . . . they shall be justified," evident, is as in Mt 12:37:

ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ, "For by your words you shall be justified, and by your words you shall be condemned." Only in our passage, where the Apostle only wants to show the impartiality of the divine judgment, he does no more clearly explain how one becomes a doer of the Law. That in his opinion justifying faith is here presupposed is shown clearly enough from the context of his doctrine. It is a general rule which the entire sentence (2:13) expresses. He adds to the negative statement οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, "for not the hearers of the Law are just before God," the corresponding position, not simply ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ λόγου δίκαιοι, "but the doers of the word are just," but he uses the future δικαιωθήσονται, "shall be justified." His discussion turns in that he points at the same time to the actual judgment of the Last Day and introduces the oppositum (opposition), to κριθήσονται. Moreover, our Confession also takes the foregoing expression of Paul in 13b not as hypothetical, but as a designation of an actual fact. The Apology remarks on Ro 2:13 and similar Scripture passages: Nec describit hic modum justificationis, sed describit, quales sint iusti, postquam jam, sunt iustificati et renati. . . In hanc sententiam dicitur: Factores legis iustificantur (Rom. 2,13), hoc est, iusti pronuntiantur, qui corde credunt Deo et deinde habent bonos fructus, qui placent propter fidem ideoque sunt impletio legis (Nor does he describe the manner of justification, but only the nature of the just, after they have been already justified and regenerated. . . In this sense it is said, "The doers of the Law will be justified," that is, God pronounces righteous those who believe him from their heart and then have good fruits, which please Him on account of faith, and, accordingly, are the fulfillment of the Law). Mueller, S.B., p. 131. (See Triglotta, p. 190) Similarly Luther on Ga 3:10: "In theology doers arise not out of works, but out of the persons, who have already been prepared by faith. They do good works. Paul speaks of such in Ro 2:13: "The doers of the law will be justified," that is, they shall be counted as justified. . . Therefore the doers of the Law are not hypocrites, who outwardly perform the Law, but the believers, who, after they have received the Holy Spirit, fulfill the Law. That means, they love God and the neighbor. So a doer of the Law is not one who becomes a doer through works, but rather the person, who already prepared through faith, becomes a doer (St. Louis Edit. IX, 338.342).

The following section, vv. 14-16, belongs to the most difficult parts of the Letter to the Romans. How its connection, marked by γάρ, with the foregoing is meant, will be shown when we have recalled the principal content. It reads, first of all: ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσιν τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοὺς εἰσιν νόμος.

"For when Gentiles who do not have the Law do instinctively the things of the Law, these, not having the Law, are a law to themselves." Thus the Apostle here speaks specifically of the Gentiles. With Luther, Philippi and others we rather translate "the Gentiles" instead of "Gentiles." For what is said in this verse and in the following concerning them, ἔθνη, that they do not have the Law, are a law unto themselves and that the work of the Law is written in their hearts, evidently applies to the Gentiles in general. The lack of the article does not obligate us to think only of a certain designated Gentile. The ἔθνη without the article also otherwise designates the Gentile world in general, (e.g. 3:29), and in our passage the adjectival modifier τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα makes the article entirely unnecessary (cf. 9:30). To be sure, however, a restriction lies in the ὅταν. ὅταν, a temporal particle, quando, quotiens, here signifies "as often as," similarly as in Mt 15:2; Jn 8:44; 1 Cor 14:26. For the Apostle here argues with a firmly established fact and with the πολλῶν he does not have in mind only a solitary instance. The meaning is not that the heathen, especially that all the heathen do that which is expressed in the protasis, v. 14a, but that this often happens among the heathen. But what often happens is this, that they who have no Law, perform τὰ τοῦ νόμου, the precepts of the Law like the Jews. The subjectively negative μὴ before νόμον ἔχοντα places this modifier in relationship to πολλῶν. Even though they have not the Law, they still do what the Law demands. And they do it φύσει, by nature, that is, not by their natural powers, but natura duce et magistra, natura docente, led thereto by their own nature, "without being led to that by commandments from the outside, without being instructed from the Mosaic Law." Philippi. For the most part men point this statement of Paul to the so-called justitia civilis (civil righteousness), which is also found among the Gentiles, in that they point to the fact that the Apostle does not ascribe to the Gentiles a ποιεῖν τὸν νόμον, a doing of the Law as a whole, but only a ποιεῖν τὰ τοῦ νόμου, a doing, an observance of isolated demands of the Law. And indeed there certainly were Gentiles, and there still are unbelievers whose conduct shows a certain outward conformity to the Law, who outwardly live honorably and righteously. These unbelievers, who, being instructed by their own nature, avoid gross shame and vice, who carry out the work of their calling industriously, who preside over their houses well, and who give alms to the poor, etc. Yes, it often occurs that otherwise wicked men still shrink back from certain evil deeds, such as lying, perjury, and treason, and rouse themselves occasionally to noble deeds, sacrifice themselves for others, and the like. And

as often as the heathen now do that which is commanded by the Law, they are, even though they do not have the Law, a law unto themselves. Here in the independent clause the μή stands before the ἔχοντες ; it would mark the contrast between having and doing. The heathen do not have, possess, nor hear the Law as the Jews do, but they are a law unto themselves. This latter expression does not signify, as Hofmann supposes, that they make God's will their will. It can express nothing else than that the Gentiles say to themselves what the Mosaic Law says to the Jews, namely, what is good and evil and that they know of themselves what they should do and not do.

This principal statement, that the Gentiles are a law unto themselves, is now further established in v. 15. The relative οἵτινες , quippe qui, here also includes a basic declaration in itself: "as those who prove." What the Gentiles prove, ἐνδείκνυνται , the Apostle now expresses thus: τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτόν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν , "the work of the law written in their hearts." These words are explained by Hofmann, Lange, Otto, and Klostermann in the sense of Jr 31:33, namely, that the doing of the Law or the fulfillment of the Law is to these Gentiles, of whom the discussion is here, a matter of the heart. But that is a thought which absolutely does not fit into the context. What the Apostle apparently calls attention to in our passage is that the Gentiles, those who are without the Law, still know something of the Law and have something analagous to that which the Jews possess in the revealed Law. And so most of the ancient and modern exegetes correctly understand the foregoing expression to mean that the work demanded by the Law, thus the precepts of the Law, is written in the heart, in the heart of the Gentiles. The Jews had the Law engraved on the stone tablets and recorded in the Torah before their eyes. The Gentiles find a similar writing of the Law in their hearts, which demands essentially the same thing as the written Law demanded of the Jews. Paul writes τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου , and not τὸν νόμον , because the Law is not written in the heart of the Gentiles in its concrete form, as it was before Israel, but according to its principal content. What is here said specifically of the Gentiles applies self-evidently to all men, who are all formed alike by nature. As far as this Law, this demand of the Law is implanted in the Gentiles, in all men in their hearts, in their nature, in as much as this forms an inalienable dowry and deposit of the human nature, so far can this Law also be reckoned to nature, φύσις v. 14. And it can rightly be said that their own nature teaches the heathen and they say to themselves what is right and not right . Certainly the natural law does not belong to the real spiritual-physical substance of man. It is, as Luthardt expresses it, a directly intellectual possession

of man. It is not first subjective, something mediated through reflection. The natural law, this inner norma agendi (acting norm), is not a product of the human self, of the human spirit. Man perceives in his heart, within himself the voice of this law, but this voice stands out as the voice of another, as one in command over his ego, and says to him what he should do and not do. The Law written in the heart is the demanding will of God, the voice of God, the Creator, to whose will all creatures are bound. In this manner God manifests to man, his creature, from his childhood, what is right and what He expects of him.

The expression: "the work of the law written in their hearts," accordingly expresses essentially the same thing as the other, "are a law unto themselves," and serves the latter as a more complete explanation. The Apostle emphasizes that the Gentiles "show" this, that the work of the Law is written in their hearts and proves thereby that they are a law unto themselves. Whereby do they prove it? Meyer, Weiss, Godet, Luthardt and others answer: by this that they perform the demands of the Law. But that had already been said in the foregoing sentence, and one does not see why the Apostle should repeat this thought even in another form. No, the verb ἐνδεύκνυνται much rather finds its modifier, as, for example, also Bengel, Tholuck, Klostermann take it, in the following genitivis absolutis, (genitive absolute), συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνελδήσεως, "their conscience bearing witness," etc. This action of the Gentiles, designated in v. 14a where it appears, is the first proof, a first ἐνδεξις; the testimony of the conscience a second proof, a second ἐνδεξις, of the Law, which the Gentiles bear within themselves. The Gentiles thus show the work of the Law written in their hearts, "their conscience also bearing witness." The συνελδῆσις is the conscience, as Cremer correctly defines it, (one's own inner voice which bears witness). This certainly attests "the moral quality of the human action." Weiss. This testimony appears, since the discussion is concerning a συμμαρτυρεῖν as something which is added to and accompanies the expression of the inner Law. Still this double testimony is of a different kind. The conscience is not identical with the natural law. The natural law is a norm, a demand of God. It attests to man in genere (generally) what is good and evil and dictates to him what he should do and not do. The conscience, on the other hand, demands nothing, but judges the concrete individual actions of man. And there it judges according to that norm imprinted in the heart of man. It is not in itself a source of the knowledge of evil and good, but brings forth its judgment out of the natural knowledge of the Law. But since the Law in the heart is the Law of God, therefore in the judgment of the conscience, which is based upon that Law, there is manifested how God judges concerning the

actions of men. In our passage the Apostle has in mind especially the so-called conscientia consequens, which criticizes the actions of man post factum. That is shown by the following more precise definition: καὶ μεταξύ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων , "their thoughts alternately accusing or else defending them." These words do not refer to the intercourse of the Gentiles among themselves, in which one criticizes the other, praising or censuring, as for example, Meyer and Weiss suppose. The expression τῶν λογισμῶν evidently points to an occurrence within man. The Apostle here further characterizes that testimony of the conscience. The "thoughts," λογισμοί , are here not the products of the thinking, but according to the context, the separate actions of the conscience. These thoughts hold communication with each other, μεταξύ ἀλλήλων , a dialog between them. There are contrasting thoughts, which at the same time contend and dispute with one another. They bring up accusations among themselves or make apologies. The object of the accusation or defense is self-evidently the man in whom they rise and fall. The latter expressions recall a legal proceeding. It is a trial which takes place within man. God is the Judge, and it is man who is subject to the judgment of God. The witness, accuser, and advocate are the conscience and the judgments of the conscience. The norm of the judgment is the Law written in the heart of man. As often as man acts in opposition to this norm, he is accused by his own thoughts, by his own conscience. On the other hand, he is defended by the same, when his actions correspond to that norm. The latter, as the ἢ καὶ , "or else," points out, is the less frequent case. "Most frequently the inner voice says: That was bad! Many times this voice steps forth also as a defender and says: No, it was good!" Godet. Despite the legalistic action of the Gentile world the principal business of each individual will consist in self-accusation." Philippi. From this characteristic of the testimony of the conscience it follows of itself to what extent it proves the existence of the inner Law, namely, as far as it continually brings this Law into application and applies to all the actions and omissions of man.

The foregoing scriptural word, Ro 2:14ff., has from ancient times been rightly accounted in the Church, and, as we have seen, been regarded as the sedes of the article of the doctrine de lege naturali (of natural law). What the Apostle presents here Koerner gives fittingly in the following words:

This is the work of the law, which is observed among the nations, and this knowledge of good and evil is ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ , "the work of God." For God, the author of nature, inscribed and implanted this faculty of knowing, understanding, judging, and discerning in the minds and hearts of men. And though this is greatly darkened since the fall, remnants exist even now. There are conceptions and κοινὰ ἔννοια , "notions common to the nature of men," which afterwards return by instruction and discipline. This is

illustrated and better explained in the church by the voice of the Word. These are practical principles, not to mention theoretical, which give exhortation regarding God and honorable actions, though even today nature assents to them and obeys them with difficulty. This work of the law then demonstrates our "conscience," συνείδησις, in these matters, συμμαρτυροῦσα, "giving witness," of what is done rightly and wrongly.... The conscience knows, and in the λογισμοῦς, "the thoughts of men," this judgment of the law of nature is made by men, sometimes accusing categorically, as in the betrayal of Catiline, the theft of Varro, the desertion of the fatherland by Leoncratus, - sometimes praising and defending by an apology, as the deed of Scipio, who returned the captive wife unharmed to his enemy, and the act of Milo, who was said to have repelled force by force.

Luther illustrates this matter in the following manner:

There is a twofold knowledge of God. The one is called the knowledge of the Law, the other of the Gospel. For God has given the two doctrines, the Law and the Gospel, so that one might know Him from them. Reason is acquainted with the knowledge of the Law. Reason has almost grasped and found out God. For it has observed from the Law what is right and wrong, and the Law is written in our hearts, as St. Paul also testifies to the Romans. Although it has been given more clearly by Moses, still it is nevertheless true, that they know it is wrong to be disobedient to father and mother or the government, likewise to murder, to commit adultery, to steal, to curse, and to blaspheme. Therefore they have punished the transgressors of the Law, such as fornicators, murderers, and thieves, with severe punishment, as did the Romans and other Gentiles. Many books have been written about this. These have had to charge murderers, thieves, rogues, and similar criminals before courts, (when they have been apprehended and dealt with as they did to others, that their misdeeds are criminal. For their own conscience speaks: That is not right that one slays another. For they have this report from the Law of God and the Ten Commandments written in their hearts by nature," etc. (St. Louis Ed., VII, 1704).

It is hereby also to be considered what Koerner also emphasizes. First, that that natural knowledge of the Law after the fall is darkened by sin. Then, that the communes notitiae in natura humana (understandings common to human nature) are exemplified and better explained by the voice of the Word in the church, so that among those who have and hear the revealed Law, the voice of the natural Law and of the conscience ruled by the same gives the most distinct message.

This traditional and almost universally accepted interpretation of our passage is not shaken by the dissensus (dissent) and the objections of some few theologians. Among the older ones it is especially Flacius, who objects with all his powers, that Paul was supposed to speak here of Law, which had really been written into the heart of the Gentiles or of all men by nature. He took also these words of the Apostle hypothetically, in the sense: If the Gentiles really did the works of the Law, which they do not do, then they would thereby prove that they are a law unto themselves, that the work of the Law had been written in their heart,

which is however not the case. That this explanation of the ὅτι and of the indicatives εἰσὶν and ἐνδεύκνυνται is grammatically impossible, that such an assumed case could not act as proof, is very obvious. But even the motive, which Flacius designated for this absolutely unsuitable exegesis, is also erroneous. He thinks that Paul, if he here spoke of an actually present inner law, would contradict his other doctrine of the general human corruption, that such a law in the heart would include in itself the bonitatem voluntatis (goodness of the will). But this is not the case. And nothing is more erroneous and more confusing than when modern theologians define the natural law as a "moral faculty." No, the natural law is something entirely different from the moral quality, the moral conduct of man. The natural law is a demand, a norm, and if now the norm is good, it is not thereby said that man also, to whom the norm is given, is good. The moral conduct of man, his inner and outer conduct, corresponds to this norm. The conscience which is ruled by the lex naturalis (natural law), however, is a witness which judges the conduct of man, and if now the judgments of the conscience are correct, then it does not follow that man agrees to such judgment from the heart, that man wills that which is right. "Conscience is not a thing which performs, but which only judges regarding works." Luther. Precisely among the infamous, who commit crimes out of evil, who with all the energy of their will resist the will of God, conscience often exercises its function most energetically. In general it appears for the most part as the accuser of man and attests to him that he is evil and does evil. But even if the conscience once defends man, even if Gentiles, unconverted men, once do that which is demanded by the Law, still this justitia civilis (civil righteousness) does not establish any exception to the common rule: By Adam's fall the human nature and essence are completely corrupted. For the justitia civilis is still no true fulfillment of the Law, no obedience of the heart, but is in itself only an outward thing and work. It also takes place there where man is destitute and empty of all fear and love to God, and which in no way makes the person good and pleasing before God.

Among the modern commentators, Klostermann, in his Correcturen zu der bisherigen Erklaerung des Roemerbriefs, has attacked the previous exegesis of Ro 2:14.15 and has taken away the natural law and the natural conscience from the Letter to the Romans. He refers οὗτοι, v. 15, back over v. 14 to οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου, v. 13, and finds in the statement of v. 15 a description of the obedience of the heart of the true doers of the Law, whose own conscience attests that they earnestly and uprightly do the will of God. This testimony of the good conscience also stands firm, he holds, in spite of the fact that they must often accuse themselves and make many complaints. The statement in v. 14 he takes as an anticipating con-

firmation of this truth with regard to the heathen, in that he understands ἔθνη to be the Gentile Christians and under the action of their conscience they correct and fulfill the Law. We cannot possibly agree with that forced interpretation, and we have already remarked above, that word order and context exclude the very thoughts upon which Klostermann lays all importance. It is more apparent that the Apostle with the "law written in the heart" means a law, a norm of the human conduct, similar to that which the Jews possessed, and not the conduct of man over against the norm of the Law. Nevertheless in one point one could be inclined to allow the correction by Klostermann. One can somewhat point the action of the Gentiles in conformity to the Law in v. 14a to the correct fulfillment of the Law as it is found only among the Christians, but by neglecting the difference between ποιεῖν τὰ τοῦ γνόμου and ποιεῖν τὸν νόμον, as also Augustine and Michelsen have done. Thereby one would not in the least alter the principal statement of the Apostle regarding the lex naturalis (natural law). It is not so remote to combine the ποιεῖν τὰ τοῦ νόμου in v. 14 with the immediately preceding οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου, as likewise to compare as parallel statements that which Paul said in v. 7 and v. 10 regarding the doing of good, regarding the continuing in good works, which is ascribed even to the Gentiles. He says in vv. 27-29 concerning the foreskin, therein fulfills the Law, further is the circumcision of the heart. In the last mentioned passages the Apostle evidently has converted Gentiles in mind, as the expression ἔθνη is very often used in a purely historical sense and also designates Gentile Christians as members of the non-Israelite people (cf. Ro 4:17.18; 11:13; 15:9-12; 15:16.27; 16:4). The Gentiles, as soon as they accept the Gospel, prove their faith by good works and so fulfill the demands of the Law. When this is done in the correct way out of love to God, would give proof for the existence of the natural law. For when the Gentiles are converted and now do good, they follow first of all the light of nature. They know beforehand what is good and evil, and now they give practical proof of this knowledge in works. The teaching from the revealed Law, which they receive in the church, certainly does not extinguish the lumen naturae (light of nature), but only kindles the same the more brightly. On the other hand, one must concede that in this context, where the Apostle as it were treats of the natural law ex professo (expressly), that the mention of the natural or civil righteousness is very much in place. We would not like to see the reference of v. 14a to the civil righteousness excluded. Luther at one time in the explanation of Ro 2:14 includes both kinds of righteousness, the outward and the inner, when

when he writes: "Certainly the heathen do no more in the natural law than the outward works, like the Jews do in Moses' Law, unless it be that they fulfill the Law with the circumcision of the heart and condemn the Jews, who are circumcised according to the flesh, vv. 26.27" (Walsh, VI, 2600).

Incidentally we mention that Feine (see Introduction, p. 92) traces back to Stoic philosophy what the Apostle here says concerning the natural law. Certainly, regarding this law, which is engraved in the nature of all men, also the Greek philosophers have known and said something. But it does not follow from that that Paul has taken this portion of his doctrine from heathen wisdom.

According to the foregoing we can now also answer the question, which we have left open above, namely, how the section 2:14ff. is joined with the preceding, or how the γάρ in v. 14 is to be understood. The general rule contained in the statement of v. 13 is here in vv. 14.15 confirmed with regard to the Gentiles. The connection is the following: With God it does not depend upon the hearing but on the doing of the Law (v. 13). That applies in general. That of course presumes a general acquaintance with the Law. That the Jews know the Law is beyond question. But that presupposition is also found among the Gentiles. For if the Gentiles do not have the revealed, written Law, they do have a substitute for it. They have the Law written in their hearts. They have the natural law. That is proven first in the oft-recurring action of the Gentiles in conformity with the Law, and then, above all, in the continual common testimony and the varied judgments of their conscience.

But now in the section that lies ahead of us there is still added a designation of time, which has given the expositors much trouble: ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, "on the day when, according to my gospel, God will judge the secrets of men through Christ Jesus" (v. 16). That the conscience gives testimony, either complaints or excuses, evidently happens in this time, and therefore it would appear strange that the Apostle refers this inner occurrence to the day of judgment. How does one escape this difficulty? Some, like Meyer and Godet, after the example of ancient theologians, separate v. 16 that which immediately precedes, and take vv. 14.15 as a parenthesis, and connect ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ὅτε, "on the day when," etc. with οἱ ποιεῖται τὸ νόμον δικαιοῦνται, "the doers of the law will be justified," v. 13, so that it says that only the doers of the Law shall be justified on the day of judgment. But such a construction is a linguistic impossibility. Others understand the day on which God judges, in that they read κρίνει "he judges," to be the present period of grace and see in the conflict of thoughts in v. 15 an effect of the preaching of the Gospel. "Every day, on which God permits

the message of the salvation of Christ to be proclaimed among the heathen, shall become for all who hear it a day of inward judgment." "There God deals with the heart of man through the Mediator of salvation, who is the same for all. He speaks His judgment over that which He finds in them, in order to move them thereby to acceptance of the proffered salvation." "And so the result of the divine judgment is that the Gentile, who sees the testimony of his conscience in agreement with the judgment of God and sees himself accused by his own thoughts, agrees with Him who judges him inwardly" - and that he then demonstrates by "obedience over against the message of salvation." Thus Hofmann, and similarly Lange and Otto. But "the day when God shall judge," κρίνεῖ, or also "judges," κρίνει, is apparently identical with "the day of revelation of the righteous judgment of God," v. 5, which dominates this entire section. That inner conflict of thoughts, v. 15, is not called forth first by the preaching of the Gospel, but is set in motion when men come into opposition with the Law of God written in their hearts. There remains nothing else than that we put the testimony of the conscience with its accusations or defenses excuse in reference to the Last Day. But not in this way that we look upon this entire inner action as an incident of the Last Day, as, for example, Klostermann does, in that he joins ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, ὅτε etc. to ἐν δείκνυνται. We rather permit the above explanation of verse 15 to stand in its full extent. We apply its statement to the present time and take the designation of time in v. 16 as a supplementary, loosely added modifier to κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων, "accusing or ever excusing." Some commentators, in order to accommodate the sudden transition from the present to the future, insert between v. 15 and v. 16 a supplementary gloss, such as "now already, but especially," or "and that will be manifest." Philippi, for example, paraphrases the meaning of Paul: "That the Gentiles have a law written in their hearts is attested, beside by their legal action, by their conscience and their thoughts, which alternately accuse or excuse already now, but especially on the day of the final judgment." And Luthardt: "Now are these occurrences hidden, then (on the day of judgment) it shall be revealed which secret sins have accused and admonished men." However, the relation of this inner process to the day of judgment is not so much this, that still on that day the conscience carries out its office of witness to man, or that the hidden judgments of the conscience shall only then be manifested, but consists rather in this, that this process then comes to a decisive end. And so we take ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε etc. as a designation of the end of judgment, by which the prolonged action of judgment is finally completed. No supplement is needed behind ἀπολογουμένων, but only a short pause. The thoughts accuse and

defend, and namely on the day of judgment, in that they accounted valid before the Judge of the world, effectively determine the sentence of God. One might well have expected the expression εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν, as Luther also has translated, "on the day" etc., in that the judgments of the conscience are directed to that day, but the Apostle, in that he writes ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, translates himself already in spirit to that terminus. It is a very short phrase and a free manner of speech, a sort of constructio ad sensum (construction according to sense) that with the simple ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε the Apostle adds the mention of the final end and the final result of the process in v. 15. The matter is carried out in this manner: The conscience gives testimony regarding the dealings of man, the thoughts bring accusations and excuses, and that takes place in this time, in the time of life. The process continues throughout the entire thime of the world, throughout the entire history of mankind. But these accusations and apologies of the conscience likewise shall be pertinent at the tribunal of the final judgment and be decided on the day of judgment. The conscience accuses and respectively defends man already before God, and in the voice of the conscience man now perceives the voice of God. On that day, however, God shall speak the final word in this transaction. Then the Judge of the world shall deem all these accusations of the thoughts as correct and valid and publicly confirm the judgment which their own conscience has already spoken over the evildoers and shall put it into effect. But He shall also respect the apologies of the conscience. To be sure, the works of justitia civilis (civil righteousness) shall never deliver man from the future wrath, which he has deserved by his disobedience. But a man, who had thus far lived honorably and dealt justly, shall suffer fewer stripes than another, who has wasted away the time of his life dissolutely and has wantonly cast off from himself all the duties of earthly life. Finally also the righteous doers of the Law who have from the heart been obedient to the demands of God which are written in the heart of man and revealed in the Word shall see the testimony of their conscience confirmed on that day and shall receive from God the recognition which men may have denied to them here. Thus the natural law, out of which the conscience begets its judgments, is then also a substitute for the written Law, insofar as with this (v. 12) it forms a norm of the final judgment.

The Apostle now defines the judgment of the Last Day more closely. On that day God shall judge "the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel."

Τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων "The secrets of men" many exegetes refer to the occurrences within man described in v. 15. But the Law written in the heart of man, the conscience and its judgments, which stand over against man as norm, witness, accuser, and defender, shall not be judged, but on that day only revealed. However, in

our passage the discussion is concerning a κρίναι , "to judge," not concerning a φωτίζειν , "to give light to," as, for example, in 1 Cor 4:5. Thus Philippi Meyer, and others understand "the secrets of men" rightly as "all in the inner and outer life, which is known to others either not at all or not according to its ethical nature." The meaning of Paul would then be this, that God on the day when He judges the secrets, shall also bring to light those secret judgments of the conscience. This interpretation is closely connected with the explanation of the following words. The expression κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου one takes most in the sense "as a result of my gospel" or "according to and in consequence of my gospel." And to the διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ "through Jesus Christ" it is only noted that the Scriptures also otherwise designate Christ as the Judge of the world, for example, John 5:22; Act 10:42; 17:31; 1 Cor 4:5; 2 Cor 5:10; 2 Tm 4:1. That God shall judge and that He shall judge through Christ, "that was," to speak with Meyer, "so generally known and so completely unquestioned, that the addition in this sense would have been very unnecessary." Indeed then the μου would also be without a pragmatic meaning, since no proclaimer of the Gospel could dispute that truth." How often Paul elsewhere mentioned the final judgment in His Letters without pointing out that this also belongs to the content of his Gospel! Paul was accustomed to teach thus. The κατὰ with κρίνειν , as in 2:6, mentions the norm of the judgment. Also Calov, Meyer and Hofmann take "the gospel" here as the norm of the judgment. This interpretation then gives character to the entire sentence. It is the Apostle's custom that in a relative clause, closely joined to the foregoing, to introduce a new and important thought into the discussion. "The Pauline logic loves to add on, always one on the other, and directly to the immediately preceding, and to spin the thread further in such dialectic development." Thus it happens that subordinate clauses logically bring thoughts of greater importance, which the Apostle only expresses in passing, without making them the real object of his doctrinal presentation in the respective place." Luthardt. Thus in our passage, in that he returns to the principal theme of this section of the discussion, the Apostle brings out this new and final element, that God shall judge men according to the Gospel which he preaches and through Jesus Christ of whom his Gospel speaks. He thereby expresses nothing else than what the Lord Himself had attested previously: "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 12:48). That God shall judge according to the Gospel does not contradict what Paul had spoken previously regarding the fact that God shall judge and reward according to works. The real decision concerning salvation and condemnation God shall make on the basis of the Gospel, or on how a man has set himself over against the Gospel

and Jesus Christ, the Mediator of salvation. It depends on whether or not he has accepted the Gospel and the salvation in Christ in faith. Jesus Christ, the Savior of men, shall ask above all how men relate to the Gospel. What position their heart has to the Gospel, to Christ, and thereby to God. τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "the secrets of men," is then a very fitting designation for this. However, the faith of the heart expresses and proves itself necessarily in good works, in the fulfillment of the Law. The Judge on that day shall also search out the work and conduct and shall measure the works of men according to the Law, which He has written in the hearts of all men and then has revealed in the Word. The Gospel is the norm for the real decision over death or life. Law and works are the norm for the public judgment, which the Judge shall deliver up on the day of judgment before all the world and whereby He motivates His decision. Thereby the Apostle at the close of this discussion points to this connection between faith and works, which we have presented in the complex of the scriptural doctrine. Precisely this statement then forms a solemn conclusion to the entire discussion regarding the judgment of the Last Day, which he had begun in 2:6.

As we review chapter 2:6-16, we briefly recall the principal thoughts and their relation to each other.

From 1:18 on, the Apostle has set forth that all mankind, especially the Gentile world, lies in corruption, is guilty before God, and has fallen under His wrath. Especially the weak judges of morals, who do that which they criticize in others, shall not escape the final judgment. After he has spoken in general regarding the future wrath and judgment, he looks in concreto (concretely) at the day of wrath and righteous judgment of God and follows with a description of the final judgment, in that he more closely demonstrates that God shall judge justly and impartially on that day. He shall reward everyone according to his works. He makes no difference between Jews and Gentiles. God shall not take into consideration the outward advantage of the Jews, the outward possession of the Law. To be sure, the Law of God, this eternally valid norm for the conduct of mankind, shall form the standard of the judgment of God, and God shall sentence Jews and Gentiles, all men, according to the Law. Even if the Gentiles do not possess the revealed and written Law, the Law has been written in their hearts, as is proven by the testimony of their conscience. Indeed, also the natural law is a norm of the judgment. The judgments of the conscience, accusations and defenses appeal as it were to the form of the final judgment. But with God it does not depend on the mere hearing and knowing of the Law, but on the doing of the Law. Above all, in conformity with the trend of the entire presentation from 1:18 on,

the Apostle calls attention to the condemnatory judgment of God. Those who sin and do evil shall be judged and shall fall to wrath and eternal condemnation. Meanwhile, in drawing a complete picture of the final judgment, he does not leave the obverse unmentioned, which shows the righteousness of the divine judgment. Those who do good and fulfill the Law shall receive a favorable judgment and eternal life. At the close of this discussion Paul still reveals that the final decision over death and life lies in the Gospel, how the Gospel alone and faith in the Gospel makes man capable of good works and of the fulfillment of the Law. The summation of the section is this:

God will reward everyone, Jews and Gentiles, impartially according to their works. For with Him it does not depend on the knowing, but on the doing of the Law.

2:17-29: The Severe Guilt of the Jews

Vv. 17-24

Already in the previous section which treated the impartial judgment of God, the Apostle had placed the Jews alongside of the Gentiles. After coming to an understanding with the Gentiles in 1:18-25, he takes the Jews to task especially. He begins his reprimand of the Jews with the words: "But if you bear the name 'Jew,'" Εἰ δὲ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάξῃ (2:17). In vigorous speech, as in 2:1-5, he selects one out of the class of men with whom he is dealing and holds up to him what he has to say to the entire group. With most of the commentators we follow the better attested reading Εἰ δέ , "but if." The other reading Ἰδέ or Ἰδε , "Behold," has arisen either through Itacism or probably a correction proposed to simplify the structure. First of all, apart from the construction of the sentence and we acquaint ourselves with the content of the individual statements. The Apostle, who was called a Jew by others and gladly called himself thus, here dealt with the Jews. The verb ἐπονομάξαι often in classical Greek means "designate," and does not necessarily designate the surname. Since the return from the Babylonian Exile Ἰουδαῖος was the name of the entire people of Israel. At the same time it was a name of honor to distinguish them from the Gentiles. The Jew boasted of what he had in advantage over the Gentiles. You rely upon the law, and boast in God" (v. 17). Those were real prerogatives of the Jews. To the Jews the true, living God had revealed Himself, while the Gentiles lived without God in the true world (Eph 2:12). God had revealed His Law to them. The expression ἐπαναπαύῃ nevertheless designates at the same time the trust of

the Jews in their God and their Law as a carnal security. The Jews leaned and relied on the outward possession of the Law and thought that it made them secure before God. The following statement, v. 18, mentions further advantage, some subjective privileges and prerogatives which resulted from their possession of the Law. The Jews, because they were instructed in the Law, knew the will, τὸ θέλημα, the absolute will of God which ordains all things. Therefore they were also capable of proving the differences between right and wrong. Thus according to Php 1:10 we take δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα, as (you test the distinctions), not in the more remote meaning, as in the A.V.: "approve the things that are more excellent." This better knowledge of theirs the Jews counted as an advantage over against others. They offered themselves as leaders and teachers to the blind, darkened Gentiles: "You are confident that you yourself are a guide to the blind, a light to those who are in darkness, corrector of the foolish," [who lack the true understanding of good and evil], "a teacher of the immature," [those incapable of judgment], because you have the embodiment of knowledge and of the truth in the Law (vv. 19.20). In the revealed Law the Jews possessed the μὶμῶσις, the real form or embodiment of the knowledge and the truth, both to be understood objectively, insofar as they had to do with the will of God. In the Mosaic Law the Jews had the full, adequate expression of the divine will, while the natural law, which is written in the hearts of the Gentiles, was greatly obscured and garbled through sin. And so the Jews were also called upon to teach others, the ignorant, unwise Gentiles, "whose foolish heart was darkened," Ro 1:21, whose moral concepts were confused concerning the true God, and to clarify His good and holy will. They also gladly undertook the role of teachers and tutors. Such readiness and confidence in the teaching office, however, is characterized by the expression πέποιθας, as well as by the heaped-up designations of their arrogant self-confidence and presumption. Here the picture of a genuine pharisaically-minded Jew is presented to us.

Paul continues in v. 21: ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἑτερον σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις, "You, therefore, who teach another, do you not teach yourself?" With the "epanaleptic" οὖν, which belongs to the subject, not to the predicate of the sentence, he again takes up the previous statements and combines them into one expression: ὁ διδάσκων, "the one teaching." The Jews made the claim to teach others, as indeed the possession of the revealed Law also enabled them to do. However, with such a claim their own conduct over against the Law stood in sharp contrast. They did not teach themselves, they did not judge themselves in the least according to that which they taught others and presented as truth. They

preached that one should not steal, and still they themselves stole (v. 21b). "Theft included all the injustices and cheatings, of which the Jews permitted themselves to become guilty in their business dealings" (Godet). They said that one should not commit adultery, and still they themselves committed adultery (v. 22a). "Adultery is a transgression which the Talmud ascribes to three most famous rabbis, Aciba, Mehio, and Eleazar. Sensuality is one of the most glaring characteristics of the Seminites (Godet). They detested the idols, and yet they committed sacrilege (v. 22b). Most modern exegetes refer ἱεροσυλεῖς to the robbery of heathen idol temples, and Godet then formulates the contrast to this: "You have an aversion to the idols, but your aversion of idolatry does not go so far that it hinders you from contemplating the valuable things which are used in idol worship, when you can make them your own, as good booty." That the robbery of temples in the heathen sense of the word was found among the Jews cannot be proven with certainty. If it did happen now and then, the mention of such isolated cases does not fit into this passage, where Paul uncovers and criticizes the common moral wrongs of Judaism. Likewise the Apostle would hardly have charged a Jew, who regarded the heathen idols as nothing, and rightly so, with sacrilege in the robbing of idol temples, but at the most with common thievery. Therefore with Hofmann, Hodge, and ancient commentators we understand under the ἱεροσυλεῖν the robbing of the Jewish temple which had been consecrated to the true, living God. But it was counted as robbery of the temple according to Mal 3:8-10, when the Jews withheld from the Lord and His temple the due sacrifices and tithes. That was a common crime of the pharisaically-directed Jews, and not only a proof of general avarice, but above all a proof for the fact that they despised the Lord and His temple. What a contradiction that was! The Jews detested the idols of the heathen, de-claimed passionately against the worship of idols, as they presumed, out of holy zeal for the Lord Jehovah and His house, and still they actually robbed, desecrated and despised the house of the Lord. "It is bad, when he [namely, the Jews,] re-gards the idols as an abomination, as if the service to his God were holy, but thereby robs his own holy sanctuary, by withholding that which he owes it" (Hofmann). Hodge remarks on ἱεροσυλεῖς "It expresses the sin of irreverence in its higher forms; either as manifested in withholding from God His due, which the prophet denounces as robbery, . . . or it may be taken in the still more general sense of profanation, the irreverent disregard of God and holy things. This all the text requires: You profess great reverence for God in eschewing idolatry; yet in other forms you are guilty of the greatest irreverence." Accordingly the Apostle lays this threefold transgression against the Jews, as earlier against the Gentiles:

iniquity over against their own bodies or unchastity, wronging against the neighbor, and crime against God. Bengel: Atrocissime peccas in proximum, te ipsum, Deum. Ad gentes Paulus ostenderit peccata primum contra Deum, deinde contra se, deinde contra alios, nunc ordinem invertit: nam peccata contra Deum in gentibus apertissima sunt, in Judaeo non item. (You sin most grievously against your neighbor, yourself, God. Paul had shown to the Gentiles, that their sins were first against God, next against themselves, next against others. He now inverts the order; for sins against God are very openly practiced among the Gentiles, but not by the Jew). Yet the transgression of the Jews is much more serious than that of the Gentiles, also than that of those hypocritical judges of morals, 2:1-5, because the Jews adorned and covered their godlessness and unrighteousness with God's Word and Law. To teach others God's Word and yet to do the opposite of that which one teaches others is even worse than to judge and criticize another for that which one does himself.

In that he combines the separate transgressions of the Jews, the Apostle closes this description of morals with the words: "You who boast in the Law, through your breaking of the Law do you dishonor God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you, just as it is written" (vv. 23.24). The last words are taken according to form from Is 52:5 and according to content from Eze 36:20-23. In the latter passage the Jews are criticized because through their exile, the necessary result of their sins, they gave the Gentiles occasion to abuse the glory and power of Jehovah, as if He had not been able to protect His people. In our passage Paul calls attention to the fact that through their godless, unholy conduct the Jews caused the Gentiles to abuse the name of God, in that they charged the sins of the Jews against the account of the God of the Jews, as if God Himself through His Law trained and instructed His people for such objectionable conduct. That καθὼς γέγραπται "just as it is written," which otherwise, when a formal quotation of Scripture is introduced, is always placed before, here stands at the end of the sentence. This shows that Paul here only adapted a word of Scripture and used it for his purpose. The foregoing criticism of the Apostle, moreover, also applies to all hypocrites among the Christians, who boast of the Christian name and the pure teaching of the divine Word. But with their conduct, be it injustice in business and labor of their hands, sins of the flesh of all kinds, robbery of their sanctuary, withholding of their gifts and sacrifices, and the like, contradict the teachings of the divine Word. Thus they give cause to the unbelievers to ridicule and blaspheme Christianity and the God of the Christians.

What now concerns the construction of this long section is the question: Where does the protasis which begins with *Εὐδὲ*, v. 17, have its apodosis, and is there an apodosis? Schott permits the apodosis to begin already in v. 17. Meyer, Weiss, Philippi, and others in v. 21, in that they take the sentences in vv. 21.22 as questions. Hofmann and Luthardt take v. 23 as apodosis. The first assumption presents a very awkward hypothesis: "If you are a Jew, then you rely upon the Law as much as you also boast about God." That is forced in this long discourse of two statements combined with *καί*, to take the first two *καί* in the sense of "as much - as also." It is contrary to the second assumption that the illegal action of the Jews can be inferred from the possession of the Law. The concise sense of the discussion would then be this: When you teach others, you do not teach yourselves. The conclusion must rather read: "If you have the Law and teach others, why do you transgress the Law and do not teach yourselves?" This third assumption it does not agree that the statement of verse 23 which describes the illegal actions of the Jews. Against the second and third assumptions one must assert above all that according to it, the evil conduct of the Jews would be the principal content and goal for the discussion. But that does not harmonize with the parallel statements of the Apostle in 1:19-32 and 2:1-5. There he depicts not only the moral corruption of the Gentile world, but calls attention to and emphasizes the fact that the Gentiles with their sins draw down upon themselves the wrath of God, that the heathen moralists and judges of morals shall not escape the judgment of God. Then there follows in 2:6-16 a detailed description of the impartial judgment of God, which shall come upon all the transgressors of the Law, Gentiles and Jews. We find room for a similar thought in our passage, when with Koppe and Godet we take the entire sentence structure, vv. 17-24, as a protasis and take for granted an anacoluthon, in that the apodosis is self-evident. The situation is that certain, unquestionable facta (acts) are expressed in conditional form in order to draw another conclusion. The meaning of Paul is: You, a Jew, have the Law, you know the will of God and teach others, but you do not teach yourself, but rather you transgress the Law and dishonor your God. If that is so, as is really the case, then what follows? Evidently, that you least of all shall escape the judgment and wrath of God. In conformity with that Koppe supplies the apodosis behind v. 24: cognita, quanto graviore poenae tibi sunt metuendae (consider what greater punishment you must fear). And Godet: "To what end will this Law serve you, of which you boast among others and which you yourselves so audaciously transgress?" It only leads to condemnation!

2:25-29

Here follows a statement regarding circumcision. This is introduced with γάρ and serves for the confirmation of the foregoing exposition. Paul had shown that a Jew who transgressed the Law will not escape the judgment of God. This statement continues in force. For circumcision also does not alter anything. Circumcision in itself does not save the Jews from wrath. The concept περιτομή, "circumcision," is forcefully brought to prominence by the elliptical μέν, to which no δέ corresponds. The Jews boasted and were arrogant in the possession of the Law, so also in the circumcision, and thought that no evil could befall them, because they were circumcised. Rabbinical proverbs read: Quandoquidem circumcisi sumus, in infernum non descendimus (In as much as we are circumcised we will not descend into hell). "Everyone circumcised has a part in the future kingdom." But Circumcision is of use only then - that the Apostle asks the Jew who is proud of his circumcision to consider v. 25, - "if you keep the law." The advantage of circumcision consists in the fact that it makes the one who is circumcised a member of the people of God and gives him a claim to all the blessings of the people of God. This applies only when upon circumcision there follows the doing of the Law. Circumcision obligated the Jews to obedience over against the Law. "Every man that is circumcised . . . is a debtor to do the whole law" (Ga 5:3). If, on the other hand, the Jew is a transgressor of the Law, then circumcision is of no use to him. Then his circumcision has become a foreskin. Then he is accounted before God as no more than a lost, castaway Gentile. From this there follows the reverse side, οὖν, v. 26, that when the foreskin, abstractum pro concreto (the thought exists before the fact), that is, an uncircumcised Gentile, observes the legal demands or the precepts of the Law, to him his foreskin is accounted as circumcision, so that he then appears before God as a member of the congregation of God. The future λογισθήσεται "to be reckoned" is, like the following κρινεῖ "he will judge," the so-called logical future, which presents that which takes place in a certain case. The following sentence, v. 27, we take in an assertive manner: "And will not he who is physically uncircumcised, if he keeps the Law, will he not judge you, who though having the letter of the Law and circumcision are a transgressor of the Law?" (v. 27). The δὲ here, as often, designates the accompanying circumstances. A judging and condemning with words is not meant, but that which takes place de facto. A Gentile who fulfills the Law, thereby, in that he is obedient to the Law and consents to it, comparatione sui (by comparison with himself) (Grotius), actually makes the Jew who transgresses the Law

appear as guilty and punishable. That the Jew acts contrary to the Law, in spite of the fact that he has it written in letters before his eyes, and by circumcision is made subject to the Law, only increases his guilt. When the Apostle speaks of the Gentiles who fulfill the Law, then that is not an abstract possibility, no fictio rhetorica (rhetorical assumption) (Calov). The ἑάν , v. 26, establishes a situation which often takes place. And the Gentile who judges the Jews is a real person. Certainly with the expressions τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσειν "keeps the requirements of the Law," and τὸν νόμον τέλειν the true obedience of the Law, is described, as it is found only among Christians, who have the Spirit of God (Ro 8:4; 13:8). But Paul also has Gentiles in mind who have become Christians, credentes in Christum (believers in Christ) (Koerner; also Meyer and Godet). Only here he does not mention expressly how an uncircumcised one comes to such obedience, in that he reserves this for later exposition. He simply calls attention to the fact that Gentiles, who are by nature uncircumcised, without becoming Jews and permitting themselves to be circumcised, still fulfill the Law, and observe the legal demands of the Law.

The following statement, introduced with γάρ , clarifies the principal statement from another viewpoint, namely that circumcision in itself is not beneficial. In the first of the two statements, v. 28, the subject is supplied out of the predicate, in the second v. 29 the predicate is to be taken out of the subject. The meaning is: "For he is not a Jew, who is one outwardly; neither is circumcision that which is outward in the flesh." Rather: "He is a Jew who is one inwardly, . . ." He is a Jew in truth, a member of the people of God. This is more exactly clarified in the second part of the sentence: "Circumcision is that which is of the heart, by the Spirit, not by the letters." Yes, such a man, who is circumcised in heart, has "his praise not from man but from God." The circumcision in the flesh reminds and admonishes the Israelites of the circumcision of the heart, that they should cut away the unrestrained impulses and outgrowths of their natural hearts and cleanse their hearts of disobedience, obstinacy, evil lusts and desires. "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiffnecked" Dt 10:16. The inner circumcision takes place, however, not by the letters of the Law, as the physical circumcision, in which one fulfills that which is demanded according to the letter of the Law in the body of another. It takes place by the Spirit, by the power of the Spirit of God. Moses already presented circumcision of the heart as a work of God: "And the Lord your God will circumcise your heart" (Dt 30:36, cf. Jn 5:44; 12:43). It is the Spirit of God who renews and cleanses the heart of man and gives power to the reborn for his

own sanctification. Whoever is thus circumcised inwardly, in the heart, whoever is born anew by the Spirit of God, be he Jew or Gentile, appears before God as circumcised, is looked upon by God as a member of His Church. Out of the circumcision of the heart there follows and flows then also the true obedience to the Law, previously discussed. Thus the Apostle gives the proud Jew to consider that his circumcision has no merit before God and also helps him naught in the judgment, if the circumcision of the heart and obedience to the Law are not bound together with it. Something similar applies to Christian Baptism as to circumcision, the sacrament of the Old Covenant. Use and significance of Baptism consists in the fact that Baptism leads man into the Church of God and makes him a child of God. At the same time it regenerates him, as a washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and obligates and empowers him to a holy, divine life and conduct. But whoever boasts of and is arrogant over his Baptism and at the same time denies the new birth, faith and obedience over against God, shall not be saved from the wrath of God by his Baptism.

Summary: The Jews, who boast of the Law and who instruct others therein and yet transgress the Law, have the greatest guilt. They shall have to suffer the severest punishment. Even circumcision helps them naught in the judgment, for the outward circumcision in the flesh has no merit in itself before God, but only circumcision of the heart, which then proves itself in the fulfillment of the Law.

CHAPTER 3

Chapter 3:1-18 Though Man's Sin Finally Glorifies God, It Retains Its Guilty Character.

3:1-4

The Apostle raises the question, in light of his prior statements as to what advantage remains for the Jews. The connection of the statement in 3:1 to the foregoing is shown by the particle of deduction, οὖν , which Calov explains:

If the Jews are no less under condemnation than the other nations by reason of sin, as the apostle demonstrates, in what respect do the Jews excel before the other nations? And what is the value (utilitas) of the circumcision?

[Si non minus Judaei, quam gentiles sub condemnatione sunt, vi peccati, quod demonstrarat apostolus, quid ergo praecipui habent Judaei prae gentibus? et quae est circumcisionis utilitas?]

Τὸ περισσόν is, quod insuper est, the advantage. The second question is subordinated to the first and essentially says the same thing. It is circumcision that makes the Jew a Jew. The answer to that question reads, πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον , "much in every way," v. 2. The advantage of the Jews over the Gentiles reached every circumstance of life.

Later, in another connection, in 9:1ff., Paul enumerates a series of such prerogatives of Israel. But here he is satisfied to name the principal advantage, Vor Allem naemlich (above all). Thus we best take the πρῶτον μὲν γάρ , "First of all, that they were entrusted with the oracles of God." God Himself had entrusted to them His λόγια as a highest good. Τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ , "The Words of God" in profane Greek are the saying of Diety, the oracula; in the Scriptures they are the statements or the revelations of the true and living God, χρησμούς ἀνωθεν κατενεχθέντας (Chrysostum). In the Septuagint, this expression is a translation of the Hebrew בְּאֵן מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם , and it is used to designate both prophecy, such as God gave to Balaam (Nu 24:4), and the Law of God (Ps 107:11). In the New Testament, the Law of Moses (Ac 7:38), the Gospel of Christ (He 5:12), and God's Word in general (1 Pe 4:11) are called λόγια Θεοῦ . In our passage this designation embraces all statements and revelations of God which were imparted to Israel and which are recorded in the Old Testament Scriptures, both

the Law and the promises - yet not, as Hofmann would have it, concurrently with the New Testament message of salvation. For first with the "But now" *Νυνὲ δέ* (v. 21), "begins the description of the Christian period" (Philippi), or, as we would rather say, of the Christian state of affairs. In that God entrusted His *λόγια* to Israel, He established Israel in this special relationship to Himself: He was Israel's God and Israel His people.

What the Apostle has said concerning the advantage of the Jews, he maintains in vv. 3 and 4 against a possible objection. He continues, "What then? If some did not believe, their unbelief will not nullify the faithfulness of God, will it? May it never be!" *Τὸ γάρ; εἰ ἠπίσθησαν τινες, μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσῃ; μὴ γένοιτο* . "What then?" What is the situation? "If some did not believe, their unbelief will not nullify the faithfulness of God, will it? Meyer, Weiss, Godet and even ancient commentators understand under the *ἀπιστία* of the Jews as their unbelief, which opposes the preaching of Christ and of the Apostles. But, as Philippi correctly remarks, in this entire context, Paul characterizes Jewry in itself, without considering their position toward the Gospel. And the expressions *ἀπιστεῖν* , "to disbelieve," *ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν* , "their unbelief," *ἡ πίστις τοῦ Θεοῦ* , "the faithfulness of God," evidently correspond to the *ἐπίστεύθησαν* in v. 2. They describe the conduct of the Jews and the conduct of God which corresponds to the good which was entrusted to the Jews by God and must be taken in the meaning of unbelief and faith. In the sense of unbelief, *ἀπιστεῖν* is also found in 2 Tm 3:13. Thus "some" Jews are many, even the majority. They have become unfaithful. They have not rightly preserved nor correctly applied the divine revelations entrusted to them. They have not believed the promises of God, they have not obeyed the Law of God, and they have thereby broken the covenant and faith with God. Thus, one might conclude that the unbelief of the Jews annulled the faithfulness of God and rendered it useless, *καταργήσῃ* , and moved God, on His part, to step back from His *λογίους* . But that is a false conclusion. Already the *μὴ* , which introduces the question containing the reproach, points to the fact that one cannot truly believe that God would reward unfaithfulness with unfaithfulness. And with *μὴ γένοιτο* (v. 4), which is equivalent to *ἰβὴ'ḥ* , Gn 44,17 and in Jos 22,29, "God forbid!"; the strongest form of negation, the Apostle energetically repudiates this thought. No, God has maintained faithfulness with the faithless. When Israel did not believe and obey His Word, He did not brake His relationship to Israel immediately. He did not withdraw His Law and His promises. He spoke further to the unfaithful, disobedient people through His Prophets and continually reminded the apostates of

His Law through their mouths. He warned, punished, charmed and enticed them with His promises until these had been fulfilled in Christ.

The unbelief of Israel does not annul the faithfulness of God. "Let God be found true, though every man be found a liar." According to the Apostle's wish and God's will it should and shall terminate in this way: that God is true, but man is a liar. "The misunderstanding that the Apostle wishes that God would be faithful because He is not, and that man would be a liar, if he is not one already, must be excluded. Therefore Paul can express himself as he does, in order to say that the outcome would be such. God is faithful and every man is a liar; that should be the final outcome. In this sense the Apostle means the development, though not as if he presented God's truthfulness and man's untruthfulness as something still not in existence. Rather, the actuality of both was not only known to him beforehand and recognized as certain, but the final result is that which passes between God and man" (Hofmann).

First of all, it treats of the special relationship of God to Israel. That shall and should be the final result of the history that has passed between God and the Jews. God stands as the true One; the One who keeps His word. However, the Jews are liars who have turned away from His words. Here, the truthfulness of God is identified with His faithfulness, and the lying of man with the unbelief of the Jews. Thus the advantage of the Jews remains, in spite of their unbelief, but it establishes no subjective advantage for the unfaithful ones. Rather, God's faithfulness and truthfulness places their unfaithfulness and lying into a more glaring light.

It reads, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης "every man a liar." All people, not only the Jews but also the heathen, shall finally stand before God as liars. Because the Apostle here generalizes his statement regarding the Jews and extends it over all mankind, he introduces the expressions ἀληθείας, "truthfulness," and ψεύστης, "liar," which have broader concept than πίστις, "faithfulness," and ἀπιστία, "unfaithfulness." All men are liars, as we also read in Ps 116:11. The Gentiles did not have the advantage of the Jews, the λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. But God did not leave them without a witness of Himself. He manifested Himself, His eternal power and divinity to them, in the works of creation, and in the preservation of the world. He gave all men to know His δικαίωμα "righteousness," and wrote His Law in their hearts (1:19,20,32; 2:4,14,15). But the Gentiles, men in genere, do not honor Him as God nor do they thank Him. They suppress the truth through unrighteousness, with their evil works they deny the better moral knowledge and do not permit themselves to be led to repentance by the goodness of God. Thus they

are altogether liars.

Still the lying of men does not destroy the truthfulness of God. God shows Himself always as "truthful," ἀληθής . He shows Himself constantly to sinful, lying mankind in nature and in their conscience, in which He admonishes, warns, and punishes them. He manifests to them His Creator love and goodness in the benefits of daily life and lets them experience the riches of His divine goodness, patience and longsuffering. And thus the final result of this history shall be, "God is true, but every man is a liar." God has overlooked nothing, has permitted nothing to be lacking, has meant only good and truth with every man, and has dealt only justly. But man has neglected it. He has cheated and disappointed God - all guilt lies with man. And in view of the purity and truthfulness of God, the lies and guilt of man appear so much greater.

Without exception, every man shall finally stand as a liar before God. Thus also the believers, both Jews and Gentiles are by nature also altogether sinners and liars. The Apostle here omits the fact that the grace of God in Christ has changed the relationship between God and man. Nevertheless, this final result in the destiny of man is not removed through faith and the grace of Jesus Christ, but rather confirmed. When God, now and in the future, looks upon the believers as just and declares them so out of grace for Christ's sake, He thereby substantiates the fact that, on their part, they are sinners and unrighteous. And when the believers, now and in the future, take refuge in the grace of God and would be justified and saved through the merits of Christ, they thereby present themselves before God as sinners and transgressors (cf. Ga 2:18).

The Apostle quotes a Scripture passage, Ps 51:4, to corroborate his statement. The quoted words read, in Hebrew, **כִּי־יִצְחָק אֶת־בְּרִיךְ אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְלֹא־יִשְׁפָּטְךָ**. They mean, "So that Thou art justified when Thou dost speak, and blameless when Thou dost judge." Paul uses the Septuagint, which offers essentially the same sense: ὅπως ἂν δικαλωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε , "That Thou mightest be justified in Thy words, and mightest prevail when Thou art judged." "Judged," κρίνεσθαι , is here to be taken as a middle, even as δικαλωθῆναι and νικᾶν , "overcome," (in a forensic sense). This Psalm quotation also shows us the end of history and the final judgment. When in the future God speaks with man and judges him concerning his conduct, then will He be righteous in His judgment. He shall convince man. It will be proven that God has not harmed man but rather has shown him only good and benefit. On the other hand, it will be shown man has offended God and has broken truthfulness and faith with Him. And thus shall God overcome and stand as pure, innocent and just when He speaks His sentence of

judgment upon man, who has deserved death and condemnation.

And that this should come about is God's will and purpose. Psalm 51:4a reads, "Against Thee, Thee only, I have sinned, and done what is evil in Thy sight." And to this is added the purpose clause, "so that Thou art justified." The final aim of man's sin is that God, in the end, is right and overcomes. Sin takes places against God's will and is an abomination to Him. When man does that which is evil in the eyes of God, then it is God's will and purpose that man in his sin may prove God right. God does not will the evil; but in case man does evil sua sponte (of his own accord). He wants this result upon the evil. The circumstance that whoever sins by whatever sin, always sins against God and does that which is evil in the eyes of God, should and does serve this end. God appears concurrently as the offended party, against whom injustice has taken place, as the one who justly judges and punishes the sinner.

3:5-8

With the transitional δέ , Paul begins another chain of thoughts. With the words "But if our unrighteousness demonstrates the righteousness of God," συνίστησθε he again takes up what was said before, in order to draw a conclusion from it. The expressions ἀδικία , "unrighteousness," and δικαιοσύνη , "righteousness," are occasioned by the δικαιοθῆναι in the Psalm quotation. According to Philippi, "The injustice (ἀδικία) of man is the general concept, to which belong his unbelief and lying disposition as species, even as the justice (δικαιοσύνη) of God is the genus, to which His trustworthiness and truth are subordinated as species." We would rather designate the relationship of these concepts to the entire conduct of man toward God, which had previously been specially characterized as unfaithfulness and falseness but is here designated with the general appellation ἀδικία . The entire conduct of God toward man, which had previously been placed under the special description of faithfulness and truth, is here given the general name δικαιοσύνη . The ἀδικία of men is their "unrighteousness," their abnormal moral nature; Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη is God's "righteousness." In the "ἡμῶν " "our unrighteousness," Paul includes all people, even himself. The Apostle had previously pointed to the ultimate result of the history that transpires between God and man and to the existing conditions. God is truthful, but every man is a liar. In this contrast lies, first of all, the fact that God's truthfulness proves the lying disposition of man. The explanation in vv. 1-4 characterizes the tendency to establish that the advantage of the Jews and God's faithfulness exposes the unfaithfulness of the Jews and the lying tendency of mankind. In the entire section beginning at 1:18, the Apostle reminds the Jews

and Gentiles of the greatness and severity of their sins and shows that they have no excuse and are punishable. That is the basic thought. But, conversely, the unbelief and lying disposition of men prove and expose God's faithfulness and truthfulness. When light and darkness stand close together, then the light makes the darkness appear much darker; and conversely, the darkness makes the light appear so much brighter. And this last thought, which is also expressed in the Psalm passage quoted, is now emphasized.

But if it is true that our unrighteousness proves the righteousness of God, "What shall we say?", "The God who inflicts wrath is not unrighteous, is He?", $\acute{o} \epsilon\pi\lambda\theta\epsilon\rho\omega\nu \tau\eta\nu \acute{o}\rho\gamma\eta\nu$. The Apostle speaks and reasons here in human terms, according to human reference and conclusions. Natural reason concludes from the above-mentioned premise that God is unjust. It reasons and concludes that, if the unrighteousness of man proves and exposes the righteousness of God, then God is unjust, because He takes vengeance upon man, who with his unrighteousness contributes to the glory of His righteousness. "It could appear as unjust, if God would punish what contributes to His glory and lies so much in His interest" (Weiss). The conclusion should really run, $\acute{o}\upsilon\kappa \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma \acute{o} \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. Is God not unjust? But Paul intentionally introduces this question, like that in v. 3, with $\mu\grave{\eta}$. "To the Apostle the sacrilege of such an assertion appears so forbidding that he himself anticipates a negative answer" (Weiss). And with the $\mu\grave{\eta} \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$, "God forbid!" (v. 6) he energetically rejects both the question and the conclusion.

The following statement, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota \pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma \kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota} \acute{o} \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\acute{o}\nu \kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\acute{o}\nu$, "For otherwise how will God judge the world?", is the basis of this rejection. The Apostle points to the well-established fact of the future judgment of the world, which in itself absolutely excludes the thought that God could deal unjustly. That God, the Judge of the world, is a just Judge is, according to the Scriptures, a fixed axiom. "Far be it from Thee to do such a thing, to slay the righteous with the wicked, so that the righteous and the wicked are treated alike. Far be it from Thee! Shall not the Judge of all the earth deal justly?" (Gn 18:25). The Judge of the whole world shall certainly not judge unjustly. In what follows Paul explains this kind of refutation more fully.

In v. 7 the Apostle again takes up what was attested in v. 4 and repeats the protasis of v. 5, only in another form. "But if through my lie the truth of God abounded to His glory" (v. 7a). He speaks here in the first person singular, as a member of humanity. And he uses the Aorist $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$, "abounded," in that he transposes himself to the end of man's history and from there looks back in time. The lying of men has become the reason that the truthfulness of God has

manifested itself so richly. It has even proven His faithfulness despite the faithless, and thus the lying of men has rebounded to the praise and glory of God. If that is so, he now asks, "why am I also still being judged as a sinner?"

Calvin, Grotius, and Philippi take the entire sentence of vv. 7.8, introduced with γάρ , as a basis for the objection in verse 5. From the standpoint of natural reason, they put into parentheses the words μὴ γένητο by κόσμον . Accordingly, the sense would be, "If my lying has served to glorify God and His truthfulness, then there is no reason that God should still judge and punish me because of my sins. If He still does, then He deals unjustly. God should be satisfied that I increase His praise with my sins. And we should then intentionally do much more evil, so that good might come from it and God might be glorified." But it would be strange if Paul, after he had rejected that false conclusion of v. 6 and had begun to refute it, subsequently established it. And this interpretation overlooks the fact that ὡς ἁμαρτωλός , "as a sinner," brings out especially the guilty character and the punishableness of sin. With Hofmann, Meyer, Godet, and others, we take the statement in vv. 7-8 in its connection with v. 6b as the basis of the rejection and refutation of that false conclusion.

The Apostle next deals more directly with the fact that the judgment of the world, to which he had referred in v. 6b, proves the divine justice. His meaning is this: If I, with my lying, have given God occasion to demonstrate His truthfulness so much more richly to His glory, what is then the reason that I, καὶ γὰρ , since I glorify God with my sin, am still counted a sinner? Why does God still reckon my sin to me as sin, as guilt, and for that reason still draw me to judgment? That can arise only from the fact that God is and remains the holy and just One. If He were not, then He would not judge me, but would rather permit my sin, from which He has only benefit, to go unpunished. The " ὡς ἁμαρτωλός gives the characteristic in which man becomes the object of a divine judgment, in order to call attention to the fact that his lying, which reveals the truth of God and thereby glorifies God, is charged against him by God as sin. Why would this happen, if God were unjust? The unrighteous asks nothing regarding good or evil, except for his own advantage. Thus God draws him to judgment as a sinner whose action glorifies God, thus He loves right and hates injustice: He cannot permit that one who has done what is evil should remain unpunished (Hofmann).

The same purpose, as that of the first part, is also served by the second part of the question in verse 8, which is also dependent upon the τί , "why" in verse 7. It reads in its entirety, καὶ τὸ μή, καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασί τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακὰ ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ.

Many expositors think that the construction here runs irregularly, that the Apostle had wanted to write originally: καὶ τὸ μὴ ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά , "Why should we not do evil?"; but, while he makes the subordinate clause introduced with καθὼς into a parenthesis and has postponed the verbum finitum of the principal clause to the end, he has made the latter dependent upon the λέγειν of the subordinate clause. However, it appears far more simple, with Hofmann, to supply an ἐστὶ after μὴ . Then the speech is smooth and symmetrical, and we translate thus, "And why not say (as we are slanderously reported and as some affirm that we say), 'Let us do evil that good may come'?" Paul here mentions an evil report, which was and still is current regarding the Christians, among whom he includes himself. This evil report was really a misinterpretation and perversion of the Christian doctrine of justification, especially in regard to statements such as Paul writes in 5:20, "Where sin increased, grace abounded all the more." From that the unbelieving world blasphemously concluded, and still concludes today that "Christians do evil intentionally, so that the grace which forgives sin might abound more freely, and might manifest itself more richly. The Christians speak and teach also, according to this role, that one should sin boldly, in order to give grace more opportunity." In our passage, within its context, the Apostle interprets this blasphemy in this manner, that the Christians boldly do evil to the glorification of God and His truthfulness, sinned unabashedly in majorem Dei gloriam, and so taught. But now with the μὴ he expressly denies that it is as they slander the Christians.

The Christians much rather disavow that Jesuit theory and practice which is ascribed to them. They avoid and flee evil, although they know that it finally glorifies God, and they teach others to avoid evil. Yes, in the name of all Christians the Apostle pronounces an anathema in holy indignation against that Jesuit moral. He testifies that the judgment and condemnation of such people, who sin in majorem Dei gloriam and teach others to sin, is entirely just. And now the Apostle asks: Why is it not so, as we are slandered? Why is it that in teaching and practice the Christians take a completely different position toward sin than is charged against them? Evidently because Christians well know and feel what a loathesome thing sin is, that sin under all circumstances, although it must finally serve to the glorification of God, bears in itself severe guilt and draws upon itself the righteous wrath of God. Because Christians anxiously guard themselves against all evil, they acknowledge that their God is a holy and just God. Thus this final exposition of the Apostle also contains an apology of

the divine righteousness and refutation of the false conclusion that God is unjust because He ordains wrath.

That God is just in His judgments coincides with the fact that man stands as a sinner before God. The entire dedication of the Apostle basically aims at this latter point. Neither through the first fact (vv. 1-4), that God's faithfulness and truthfulness prove themselves also in the faithless ones and liars, nor through the second fact (vv. 5-8), which follows the first, that the unrighteousness of man sets the righteousness of God in the light and glorifies it, are the moral responsibility of man and the guilty character of sin destroyed nor even lessened. The Apostle takes away every excuse from sinful man. In no respect is it a merit or work of man, nor is it the natural result of sin, that sin serves to the glorification of God. But it is the wonderful providence of God, that God brings something good out of that which is evil in itself and which has in itself only evil and fatal results. What Olearius says in his "Criticism Sacris" on the passage Ro 3,1-8 applies here,

"When God in his wisdom turns our wrongdoing to his glory, this is not to the credit of our vices, but only the work of divine wisdom and providence, which knows how to turn even evil things into good, since evil things per se and by their nature cannot match anything except what is similar to their nature."

[Cum Deus sua sapientia in suam gloriam convertit scelera nostra hoc nullum est vitiorum nostrorum promeritum, sed totum divinae sapientiae ac providentiae opus, qui malis etiam rebus bene uti sciat, cum mala per se suaque natura numquam rem aliam nisi sibi similem parere possint.]

The basic thought of the apostolic discourse in vv. 1-8 is that:

Man is and remains guilty and punishable before God, in spite of the fact that the lying disposition of man does not destroy God's truthfulness and in spite of the fact that the sin of man results in the glorification of God.

3:9-20: Scriptural Proof for the Common Guilt of Mankind

Vv. 9-18

With a question similar to the one in v. 1, the Apostle in v. 9 introduces a new section, "What then? Are we better than they?" Are we Jews, in whose name Paul speaks, better than the Gentiles? Thus we translate and understand the προεχόμεθα with Philippi, Weiss, and most of the ancient expositors. This can be passive, in the sense, "Are we excelled?" But the thought that the Jews could perhaps be excelled by the Gentiles lies entirely outside the context. Or is it to be taken as a middle voice? The middle προέχεσθαι usually signifies: "to hold something before one" or "pretend," and is always used transitively and therefore must always have an object. The τὸ οὖν has been taken this way

(for example, by Schott), and τὸ οὖν προεχόμεθα , as one sentence in the sense: "What shall we say or can we use an excuse?" But to this question the answer, οὐ πάντως , does not apply. It would have to read Οὐδὲν πάντως . Or one can imagine an object and cover the difficulty by paraphrasing. "Are we in a position to offer a defense?" "Is the situation such that something serves us as a defense and gives us security against the avenging righteousness?" (Meyer). "Do we still have a defense?" (Luthardt). No, since προεχόμεθα is here used intransitively it cannot be understood except than as the active προέχειν , otherwise used as intransitively (intransitivum).

With the energetic Οὐ πάντως , "not at all," the Apostle answers this question in the negative. No, we Jews do not put ourselves above the Gentiles; we are no better than they. The objective prerogative of the Jews, (vv. 1ff)., which continues to exist in spite of their unfaithfulness, does not, in itself carry any subjective prerogative or advantage for the faithless. Paul justifies the negative answer with the statement, "For we have already charged that both Jews and Greeks are all under sin." The emphasis rests on this statement. This statement contains the result of the entire previous presentation of doctrine from 1:18 on, and precisely this result the Apostle wants to point out. The first person plural in προηγουσάμεθα is the editorial "we." Previously he had proven that the Gentiles (1:18ff.) and the Jews (2:17ff.) and all men without exception (3:1ff.), are under sin. To be under sin, ὑπ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι , is not synonymous with "to be a sinner" or "to sin." The expression designates "not the conduct of men, but the condition" in which they find themselves (Luthardt). But, also, it is not the meaning that the Jews and Gentiles are altogether enslaved under sin. This point is not made prominent in the prior passages because Paul points instead to the common guilt of all mankind. All men have sin as a debt, have the guilt of sin resting upon them as a heavy, pressing burden. God imputes their sins to them; hence, they are guilty and punishable before God. Certainly, "to be guilty" and "to be under sin" presumes and includes the thought that whoever is "under sin," whoever is guilty, is a sinner in himself and has sinned. Only someone who is actually a sinner and has committed sin shall be regarded by God as a sinner and held accountable for his sin. This is exactly what the Apostle had presented previously, from 1:18 on. First, that all men, both Gentile and Jew, are sinners and have committed every conceivable sin; second, that their transgression contains in itself a severe guilt, that sinful men have no excuse, are fallen under the wrath of God, shall not escape the future judgment and shall be judged by God as sinners.

Paul continues with καὶ ὡς γέγραπτα , "as it is written," introducing a scriptural proof. Everything that he himself speaks and writes is certain truth; as an Apostle, he speaks and writes God's Word. However, he still uses another authority to support his own and proves the accusation which he had raised against Jews and Gentiles by the testimony of the prophetic Scriptures of the Old Testament. Thus the Christian doctrine of the complete and basic corruption and damnable-ness of the human race is corroborated by two reliable, infallible witnesses. At the same time the Apostle, through the arrangement of short, pithy Scripture passages in quibus magna est verborum atrocitas (in which there is a great fierceness of words) (Melanchthon), gives a summary of the foregoing detailed presentation of morals. This places before man's eyes a portrait of himself, at which he must reasonably be alarmed. The first Scripture passage, vv. 10-12, is the beginning of Psalm 14, which attests to the universality of human corruption. These are the words of Psalm 14,

"The fool has said in his heart, 'There is no God.' They are corrupt, they have committed abominable deeds; There is no one who does good. The Lord has looked down from heaven upon the sons of men, to see if there are any who understand, who seek after God. They have all turned aside; together they have become corrupt; there is no one who does good, not even one."

From out of this passage, Paul takes only that which directly serves his purpose, omitting what is said in the first verse concerning the frivolous deniers of God. In the second verse Paul omits the reference to God looking down upon the earth and begins with the statement, "There is no one who does good," or, what is essentially the same, "There is none righteous." Here he anticipates the conclusion of the third verse, "not even one" in order to show the principal thought the universality of sin. He continues, corresponding to the sense of the Psalmist: "There is none who understands," who would let himself be instructed of God; "There is none who seeks for God," ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν Θεόν , no one who concerns himself about God. Here the Psalmist, and with him the Apostle, traces the general moral corruption to its root; that is, the inner alienation of man from God and enmity against God. And in concluding it reads, "All have turned aside, together they have become useless (ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν); there is none who does good, there is not even one."

The following quotations express the way in which human corruption demonstrates itself in speech (vv. 13-14) and in the actions of man (vv. 1-17). Both of the first two statements of verse 13 are reproductions of Ps 5:9 (v. 10 in Mt) Here and in what follows, Paul adopts the translation of the Septuagint. "Their throat is an open grave", their throat exhales death; "With their tongues they keep de-

ceiving" (according to the original text, "they make their tongue smooth"), they flatter the simple, in order to draw them more easily into their snares. The statement of 13c, "The poison of asps is under their lips" is taken from Ps 140:4. The poison of asps is a picture of insidious corruption.

"Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness" (v. 14). According to the Hebrew text, Ps. 10:7, the words run, "His mouth is full of curses and deceit לִשְׁמוֹנֶה and oppression לְעִוָּת . Instead of "deceit," the Apostle uses the expression of the Septuagint, $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma$, "bitterness," which really has more meaning than the Hebrew לִשְׁמוֹנֶה , but includes the latter. He omits the third word, since with the $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ of the Septuagint the Hebrew לְעִוָּת is actually incorrectly translated. Thus the various instruments of speech, throat, tongue, lips and mouth all are used by the unrighteous to corrupt the neighbor.

The three statements in vv. 15-17 are shortened reproductions of Is 59:7-8. First, "Their feet are swift to shed blood" (v. 15). They rush to shed blood, since they have such joy in doing so. According to Scripture and the judgment of God, everything that man does to cause harm to a neighbor's body or life is murder, manslaughter and shedding of blood. "Destruction," $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\rho\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha$, and "misery," $\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omega\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$, abstractum pro concreto, "Destruction and misery are in their paths" (v. 16). On their way through life they leave behind them the bruised, the wretched and the unfortunate, that is, those whom they themselves have trampled under foot and have made unhappy. They pursue their advantage ruthlessly and trample under foot all who stand in the way of their interests. "And the path of peace have they not known" (v. 17); actually, they have not learned to know, $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa \epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$. A path, upon which peace, salvation, and blessing would be spread abroad, has reminded entirely unknown to them. They have become accustomed to doing only evil. With the final statement in v. 18, from Ps 36:1, "There is no fear of God before their eyes" the Apostle again indicates that evil source out of which all evil words and works of man flow. They have no fear of God, which could hinder them from doing evil.

It should also be observed that the cited Psalm passages, with the exception of Ps 14:1-3, speak of the godless as distinct from the righteous and that in Is 59:7-8 the discussion is about the apostate Israel. But the godless are certainly the men of this world, among whom the universal human corruption has brought forth only its full, ripe fruits. Apostate Israel has become like the Gentiles, the sinners of this world. "Men are always described as they are in themselves and have become by themselves" (Hofmann). And, finally, even the righteous have not, in this life, entirely laid aside the common human nature. We recall further

the fact that the Apostle, in his portrayal of morality, views not the wild barbarian hordes, but primarily the civilized world of his time. Similarly, the highly praised culture and humanity of our own day does not make man any better or nobler than Paul describes them. It is indeed a dreadfully dark picture which the Apostle sketches here, but it is an accurate picture of mankind. Thus the Scriptures describe fallen man. Yes, of man, who had come forth by the creative hand of God in the image of God, only such a caricature and grotesque picture of man remains.

3:19-20.

To what has already been said, the Apostle adds a remark concerning the Law and the people of the Law and reminds his readers of something they already knew. We understand the "law," the νόμος, not as the entire Old Testament Scriptures as Philippi, Meyer and Weiss do. Rather, with Luthardt, Hofmann and others, we take νόμος in its primary meaning, as it is found completely in the second chapter and evidently also in 3:20, as the revealed Law, the Mosaic Law. In everything that the Law says and commands, it speaks to those who are under the Law, that is, to the Jews, τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; actually, to those who subject to the Law. Among the Jews, life in all its separate and smallest parts was regulated by the Law. However, the purpose of the Law and of its instruction is "that every mouth may be closed," so that no mouth might be able to bring forth anything to its justification, "and all the world may become accountable to God," ὑπόδικος. Thus the Law should serve and aid only the end that the final result, as previously established by Paul, might be reached. The fact that the Gentiles, among whom the formerly named abominations come out most vividly and plainly, are guilty and punishable before God because of these abominations, is self-evident. So also the Jews, among whom these evils and vices were hidden, mostly by a certain outward righteousness or an appearance of devoutness, are not superior and no better off with God than are the Gentiles for that reason. Their Law, which they have in preference to the Gentiles, serves precisely to the end that according to God's intention, they also must be silenced before God and appear worthy of punishment when God enters into judgment with them.

The result is that every mouth shall be stopped and that all the world, both Gentiles and Jews, are worthy of punishment. That the Law has and should have this result, even among those who are under the Law, is established in v. 20 by the fact that it does not, and cannot, have the opposite effect which men somewhat expect. The Law assists no one to righteousness. "Because by the works of the law no flesh will be justified in His sight." The works of the Law are the works

which the Law demands. The future "will be justified," δικαιωθήσεται, is the logical future, and we take it as the future middle, δικαιουσθαι, "justify oneself," as Luther, Hofmann, and others do. The connection with ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ instead of with ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ, speaks against the passive sense. Neither now nor ever shall it come to pass that any man shall stand as justified before God as a result of the works of the Law. And why not? Because by the Law comes the knowledge of sin. The Law leads those who hear it and rightly perceive it to the knowledge that they have not done, nor are they able to do, the things demanded by the Law. And, thus, by the Law shall men be convinced of their transgressions of the Law, of their guilt and of their worthiness of punishment.

In this section from v. 9 to v. 20, the Apostle concludes from the entire previous discussion, and proves further from the Scriptures, that all men, Gentiles and Jews, are guilty and punishable before God.

3:21-31: Justification by Faith

Vv. 21-26.

Here begins the second principal part of the Letter, 3:21-5:21, which was introduced and prepared for by the first part, 1:18-3:20. The principal theme of the Letter is now expanded which is, "The righteousness that avails before God." This theme was also served by the first part, which established the common human corruption. For only he who has correctly understood sin can also grasp and understand what the righteousness, revealed in the Gospel, is all about. Only he who correctly feels and senses his loss and unworthiness, can also value the great treasure of the New Testament, which is the grace of God in Christ.

The Apostle renews the discussion which he had left off and addresses his readers as with a raised voice, Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, "But now apart from the Law the righteousness of God has been manifested." We do not take Νυνὶ δὲ in the temporal sense, as, for example, also Philippi does; rather, with Fritzsche, Hofmann, Meyer, Weiss, and Godet we take it in its logical significance, as it is often found elsewhere, as in Ro 7:17, 1 Cor 5:11, 12:18, 13:13. It introduces a material contrast, as does the classical νῦν δέ and the Latin *atqui*, *nunc vero*. The contrast here is not so much the Christian period with the pre-Christian period nor the revelation of the Gospel with the revelation of the Law, but rather the general Christian status of things with the status of things outside of Christianity. That which follows verse 20 contrasts, not only that which had been said in the immediate preceding verses concerning the Law, but also the last entire section (vv. 9-20), and with it the entire treatment from 1:18 on, which had been gathered together in a summary in the

section vv. 9-20. The Apostle had previously proved that all men, Gentiles and Jews, are under sin, and that the whole world is guilty and punishable before God. Even now, in the present time, that is the condition of things outside of Christ and the Gospel. Paul had previously spoken only in the present tense. But now in Christ and the Gospel, a righteousness has appeared which casts an entirely different light on the position of man to God and which gives a new appearance to the world.

But what kind of righteousness is it that the Apostle here praises and recommends to his readers? What does the expression δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, "righteousness of God," which we find twice in verses 21-22 and upon which all emphasis lies, mean? That is the cardinal question, one which we have already discussed briefly in chapter 1:17, and which we must examine more closely. In no case can we think of it as an essential attribute of God, nor of a "righteousness" in the sense of truthfulness or goodness. For as already noted, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ is revealed in the Gospel, or, as in our passage, has been revealed and given to men. Thus it appears as a gift of God to men. It can only be asked whether this "righteousness" means "an ethical conduct of man" or "an ethical relationship of man to God." The Romanists understand this to be justitia infusa (similarly Osiander, the Arminians and Socinians). In their own way, the Rationalists have given a new meaning to what Paul says concerning the righteousness of God. According to Wegscheider, the kernel of the doctrine of righteousness is that man can enjoy the good pleasure of God not by single, outward and meritorious works, but only by true faith. That is, by a disposition toward God, ordered according to Christ's example and teaching and regulated in faithful fulfillment of His will, and indulging in the hope of a future where virtue finds the prize of eternal salvation.

The theologians of the Schleiermacher school lay all stress on the righteousness of life which follows from faith (for example, Olshausen, Neander, Nitzsch, Dorner). Olshausen remarks: "Nothing can be acknowledged or declared righteous when it is not righteous." And further, "The Law could not rise above an external legalism; however, with regeneration by grace as an inner condition, the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, is created in the believers and fulfills the highest demands." On the basis of our passage, Beck speaks of a "Christian morality." Klostermann writes, "The δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, of which Paul speaks in vv. 21-22, is exactly the same as in 1:17. It is the new morality, with God manifested as the Creator, which has appeared in the world with the Christian life of faith and which permits itself to be observed in man as an immediate result and effect of his faith in the Gospel, in a measure which always grows with faith itself." The last branch of this

tendency is the Ritschl school, which has completely dissolved particularly the concept "justification, along with all Christian concepts.

Against the Roman, and these Romanized interpretations of the later German theologians, the American theologian Hodge protests in the name of Protestantism and fights against them "as for the life of the Church." He appeals to the confession of the Church and to the experience of all believing Christians. "Appeal may safely be made on this subject to the testimony of the Church or to the experience of the people of God in every age and nation. They, with one accord, at least in their prayers and praises, renounce all dependence on their own inward excellence, and cast themselves on the work or merit of Christ." Meanwhile, the recent German positive theologians such as Philippi, Meyer, Weiss, Hofmann, Luthardt, Godet, Kahnis and Thomasius, also energetically defend the old Protestant interpretation of δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ the justitia imputata, even when they take Θεοῦ as the genitivus auctoris, and designate this righteousness as a righteousness originating from God and established by God. Yes, whoever still has a spark of a Protestant conscience shrinks back from the thought that the righteousness and piety which are found in us could at the critical moment, be put into competition with sin and guilt and with the wrath and judgment of God. He confesses, with Luther, "Therefore, this is a great sermon and a heavenly wisdom, which we believe. Our righteousness, salvation, and comfort stand outside of us, that before God we are righteous, acceptable, holy, and wise while there is in us only sin, unrighteousness and foolishness. In my conscience, there is only the feeling and awareness of sin and the terror of death, and I must look elsewhere and believe that no sin and death is there." (EA 14, p. 181.)

The Lutheran-Protestant doctrine of the justitia imputata, to which the experience of all the children of God gives testimony, has a firm, solid foundation in Scripture. The Scriptures have left no doubt as to what we must understand about the righteousness of which Paul here speaks. In the present section, the locus classicus of the Pauline doctrine of justification, there are found, together with δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, other similar expressions, which evidently should modify this concept. These are, δικαιούμενοι, "being justified," (v. 24,) and Θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν, "the just God," or ὁ Θεὸς ὃς δικαιώσεται, "God who will justify," (vv. 26-30). If we want to make sure as to what is meant with the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ in vv. 21-22, then we must first of all ascertain what the δικαιῶν, spoken of God, and the δικαιώσεται, spoken of man, signify.

The first question is "What does δικαιῶν mean when predicated of God, and what does it mean generally? Kahnis remarks very fittingly in his Dogmatik (I,599),

"According to the causative meaning of the Hiphil פָּרַחֵם , and in accord with the character of the verbs ending in -ow, $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omega$ can only mean "make righteous." Nothing is more superficial than the admission that, in spite of this incontestable fact, the Roman interpretation of $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\omega$, by which it means to make one morally righteous, is the proper grammatical interpretation, as Grotius, David Schultz and Olshausen have taken it. It depends upon which sense "to make" is used. In German, anyone can be said to be made bad; that is, work upon him in such a way that he becomes bad. But also, in popular speech, to make him look bad. Thus $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\omega$, "to cleanse," can signify not only a real cleansing, but also a declarative cleansing (Acts 10:15). Hofmann writes on 3:26, "For, indeed, the connection of $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$ and $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha$ shows that $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omega$ is regarded as an action which makes the one to whom it happens righteous. But, from this, it does not follow that this "being righteous" is meant as a divine attribute in the sense of an inherent attribute." It can also be as Hofmann further explains a "being righteous" according to the judicial judgment of God, and thus $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omega$ be meant as a "being declared righteous." We translate with Luther, "It is God who makes righteous." This act of "making righteous," however, can also be declarative and can mean as much as "to bring about," so that one is righteous, $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, according to God's judgment and opinion, and can also signify "to declare righteous" or "hold or regard as righteous." Thus $\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omicron\omega$ signifies essentially "make worthy," and never something else, such as "honor" or "regard as worthy." And whether $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\omega$ actually designates an ethical change or is a declaration of righteousness (justitiam infundere or justitiam imputare), or perhaps both (in one passage this, in another that), only the use of language can determine.

Cremer, in his Woerterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gracitaet, has gathered together all the passages from extra-biblical Greek literature in which this word is found. He gives the result of his inquiry in these words, "In profane Greek it means to establish a $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$; namely, in a forensic manner through judgment, never aliquem justum reddere but aliquid justum censere, 'to consider as just' or 'to acknowledge as just.'" The most usual meaning of $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omega$ is to consider just and reasonable, and then it is always combined with a non-personal object, often with an object clause, though mostly with an infinitive clause. It is usually found in such combinations as, $\nu\epsilon\mu\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\alpha}\phi\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\ \tilde{\omega}$, "I regarded it as good to bury the dead" (Euripides). But it also often has a personal object with it and then it means as much as "condemn" or "punish," very seldom the opposite: "justify." It is thus, completely without exception, a verbum forense and never designates a making righteous in the sense of moral change. Later in Greek ecclesiastical language, it serves also for the designation of council decisions (for

example, Can. 17, conc. Nic.: ἐδικαίωσεν ἡ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη σύνοδος).

The idiom of the Old Testament Greek agrees with this. Here, also, a judgment is indicated by this expression, never an enabling for righteous action.

In the Septuagint δικαλῶ is the usual translation of דִּקְיָה, which always signifies "speak justly," "justify," "declare righteous," or "absolve." As the one exception, Daniel 12:3 could be adduced. But this is only an apparent exception to the rule. If there it is said of the teachers of the Church

דִּקְיָהוּ יִיְיָ, which, however, is not translated into Greek with δικαιοῦντες, then it can very well mean that the teachers make many into righteous ones who,

according to God's judgment, are righteous. Most frequently דִּקְיָה, δικαιοῦν is used of the official judgments of the judges and rulers of the people. Thus,

for example, in Deut. 25:10, וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁפָּטוּ שְׁנֵי אָדָם אֶחָד אֶת־אֶחָד וְהָיָה לָהֶם מַלְאָכִים וְהָיָה לָהֶם דִּקְיָהוּ In the Septuagint, Ἐὰν δὲ γένηται ἀντιλογία ἀνὰ μέσον ἀνθρώπων

καὶ προσέλθωσιν εἰς κρίσιν, καὶ κρίνωσι, καὶ δικαίωσωσι τὸν δίκαιον καὶ καταγνώσιν τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς . "If there is a dispute between men and they go to court, and the

judges decide their case, and they justify the righteous and condemn the wicked."

In 2 Sm 15:4, the statement of Absalom is related, "O that one would appoint me judge in the land, then every man who has any suit or cause could come to me, and

I would give him justice," דִּקְיָהוּ, καὶ δικαίωσω αὐτόν . In Is 1:17

the demand is made of Israel: ῥύσασθε ἀδικούμενον, κρίνατε ὀρφανῶ καὶ

δικαίωσατε χήραν . The last phrase, in the original text, reads, וְהָיָה רִיבְךָ.

Those addressed should protect the widows and orphans against their oppressors and assist them in their rights before the court, so that they bring about an absolving

judgment for them. In Is 5:23, the godless judges are criticized, "who justify the wicked for a bribe," οἱ δικαιοῦντες τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἕνεκεν δῶρων . In the

famous statement of Pr 17:15, "He that justifies the wicked, and he that condemns the righteous, both of them are an abomination to the Lord," the Hebrew

is translated into Greek with ὃς δίκαιον κρίνει τὸν ἄδικον . Thus the

דִּקְיָה, and with it, δικαιοῦν, is expressly designated as a declaration of

justice. In the special meaning of the Piel, דִּקְיָה, made to appear righteous, is

found as δικαιοῦν in Eze 16:15-21. By their sins, the rebellious city of

Jerusalem have made their sister cities, Samaria and Sodom, appear as righteous.

וְהָיָה שִׁמְךָ דִּקְיָה, καὶ ἐδικαίωσας τὰς ἀδελφάς σου .

In Gn 44:16, the Hithpael of דִּקְיָה and the passive Aorist of δικαιοῦν is used in the sense "to justify oneself." Here, the sons of Jacob asked Joseph,

who had seized them because of the theft of the cup, דִּקְיָהוּ אֲנִי, τί δικαιο-

ῶμεν, "How can we justify ourselves?" In the Psalm passage discussed before

(Ps 51:4), it is said of God, "Thou art justified," δικαιωθῆς, synonymous with "to be just" and "to appear as just," יָצַדְתָּ אֱלֹהִים. But now these forensic expressions, יָצַדְתָּ and δικαιούσιν, and the corresponding יָצַד, δικαιοῦσθαι, δίκαιον εἶναι, are applied in particular to the dealings between man and God and to God's judgment and sentence over mankind. See also Ex 23:7 "Do not kill the innocent or the righteous, for I will not acquit the guilty," וְשֹׁרֵר יִצְדֵּךְ אֵל. Here, the Septuagint wrongly introduces the second person, οὐ δικαιώσεις.

According to 1 Kgs 8:32, Solomon prays that the Lord might hear in heaven and judge His servants, יִצְדֵּךְ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְשֹׁרֵר יִצְדֵּךְ. The dictum of Paul in 3:20, "Because by works of the Law, no flesh will be justified in His sight," Ἀλότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, alludes to Ps 143:2, "And do not enter into judgment with Thy servant," יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּיָדְךָ יִצְדֵּךְ אֶת יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, οὐ δὲ οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιον σου πᾶς ζῶν. The passive δικαιωθήσεται is here, as elsewhere, δικαιοῦσθαι and δικαιωθῆναι, the middle passive, corresponding to יָצַד. No living person is or appears before God as righteous. Similarly Job 9:2, ["But how can a man be in the right before God?"], אֵיךְ יִצְדֵּךְ אִישׁ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי, πᾶς γὰρ ἔσται δίκαιος βροτὸς παρὰ κυρίῳ. In other passages the δίκαιον εἶναι is expressly modified by δίκαιον ἀναφανεσθαι (as in Job 40:3). Although Job knows that no man is righteous before God, still by faith he is certain of the final judgment of justification by God, "Behold now, I have prepared my cause; I know that I will be vindicated" that is, I will appear and stand as justified before God, οὐ δίκαιος ἀναφανοῦμαι. In Is 50:8, the suffering Messiah speaks, יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ יִצְדֵּךְ, οὐ ἐγγύζει ὁ δικαιώσας με. Τίς ὁ κρινόμενός μου, "He who vindicates Me is near; who will contend with me?". In the Messianic prophecies the discussion is frequently about the gracious New Testament act of justification, especially in Is 53:11, יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ יִצְדֵּךְ (δικαιώσαι). The last phrase of the sentence serves as an explanation, "he will bear their iniquities." The meaning can be only that the Servant of the Lord shall justify many, release them from their sins in that He bears, or takes upon Himself, their sins. Of the New Testament people of God, Is 45:25 says, יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִצְדֵּךְ, "In the Lord all the offspring of Israel will be justified." The Septuagint translates this as ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιωθήσονται, "they will be justified by God." This "being justified" shall be imparted (awarded) to them by God.

Appropriate to יָצַד, יָצַד, δικαιούσιν, δικαιοῦσθαι we must occasionally, where the context indicates, understand the substantive יָצַד, δικαιοσύνη the justitia imputata. Thus in the well-known prophecy of Jr 23:6, "And this is His name by which He will be called, the Lord our righteousness" יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִצְדֵּךְ.

Further, in Is 45:24, those who turn to God shall say, "In the Lord is righteousness," ($\text{יְהוָה} \text{ דְּלִיטָה}$, δικαιοσύνη). According to Ps 72:2-3, "righteousness," ($\text{יְהוָה} \text{ דְּלִיטָה}$, δικαιοσύνη) and peace appear as the blessings which flow from the King Messiah upon His people.

The use of language in the Apocrypha coincides completely with the Septuagint, as the Cremer's examples prove.

In the New Testament we encounter the same terminology. In the non-Pauline writings, δικαιοῦν and δικαιοῦσθαι never have a different meaning than "to justify." In Luke 10:29 it says of that scribe ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιοῦν ἑαυτόν, "But wishing to justify himself" (see also Luke 16:15). In Luke 7:29 we read, οἱ τελευτῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεὸν βαπτισθέντες "they justified God, having been baptized." Similar usage is found in Mt 11:19 and Luke 7:35. The expression of Mt 12:37 refers to the judgment of God, ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιοθήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ, "For by your words you shall be justified, and by your words you shall be condemned." Also in Luke 18:14, where it is said of the repentant publican, that he went down justified, δεδικαιωμένος, to his home. According to Acts 13:38-39, Paul testified to the Jews in Antioch of Pisidia, ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσέως δικαιοθῆναι, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται, "from all things, from which you could not be freed through the Law of Moses, through Him everyone who believes is freed."

However, δικαιοῦν is especially a terminus technicus of the Pauline letters, particularly in Romans, Galatians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians. Elsewhere, it is found only in 1 Tm 3:16 and Tt 3:7. And, certainly, except for Ro 3:4, where it is said that God, when He speaks and condemns, shall hereafter be justified, δικαιοθήσῃ, and 1 Tm 3:6, where it is said that Christ is justified, ἐδικαιώθη, in the Spirit, it always denotes a divine act of salvation for sinners. But what kind of divine action is meant? According to prior linguistic usage, there can be doubt. It is absolutely excluded and entirely inconceivable that Paul should have used the expression in a different sense from the one used by all prior Greek authors. Whenever a Greek spoke, wrote, heard, or read about a δικαιοῦν, he never thought of anything other than of a judgment. Whoever understood Greek could not have understood Paul, if with this expression he had meant an ethical change in the inner man. That δικαιοῦν is a forensic concept also to Paul is immediately apparent when one looks into these letters only casually. When Paul in Ro 4:5 calls God τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, "Him who justifies the ungodly," corresponding to the $\text{יְהוָה} \text{ דְּלִיטָה}$ in the Old Testament, then it is evident that δικαιοῦν designates a pronouncement of righteousness. When instead of

πίστει δικαιοῦμεθα he also writes ἡ πίστις λογίζεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, "faith is reckoned as righteousness," (Ro 4:3, 22-24; Ga 3:6), then with δικαιοῦν he evidently has a justitia imputata in mind. When in Ro 8:33 ἐγκαλεῖν, "to bring a charge," and δικαιοῦν and in Ro 5:18 κατάκριμα, "condemnation," and δικαίωσις, "justification," are set in opposition to one another, then δικαιοῦν or δικαίωσις designate an absolution or acquittal in contrast to an accusation or a condemnation. And in Ro 5:19, instead of δικαιοῦν, there is the expression δίκαιον καθίσταται "be made righteous." In other passages also, such as Ro 3:26-30 and Ga 3:8, δικαιοῦν certainly means "to justify; to declare, hold and look upon as righteous." No linguistic result is more certain. The Apology defines it very correctly, (Significat enim justificare justum pronuntiare seu reputare, absolvere a peccatis coram tribunai Dei,) "To justify signifies to pronounce or regard as righteous, to absolve from sin before the tribunal of God."

The passive form δικαιοῦσθαι is to be taken as a middle voice in combinations such as δικαιοῦσθαι ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ (Ro 3:20), παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ (Ga 3:11), and elsewhere such as Ro 3:24, 28 and Ga 2:16, 17. This is in the sense of becoming "a righteous man," δίκαιος, who is righteous according to the judgment of God, in accord with the use of language in the Septuagint, which corresponds to the Hebrew יָדָע , especially to the $\text{יָדָע} \text{ בְּיָד}$ in Job. So also Luther, Cremer, Hofmann, and others. And to δικαιοῦν δικαιοῦσθαι the expression δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, "righteousness of God," (Ro 1:7; 3:21-22; 2 Cor 5:21), along with δικαιοῦν, δικαιοῦσθαι and $\text{יָדָע} \text{ בְּיָד}$, points to the position or the relationship of man to God. It designates "the relationship of being righteous, into which man is placed by an act of God, in which He declares one righteous" (Meyer), "the righteousness established by a judgment of God" (Cremer), "a condition of man, in which he has God on his side" (Hofmann, Luthardt), conditio Deo probata (Grimm), "the imputed righteousness" (Schierlitz). Complete agreement reigns here among the older and modern lexicographers. That we take the genitive Θεοῦ, along with Luther and the ancient theologians, as well as Fritzsche and Philippi, grammatically as (genitivus objecti) the objective genitive and translates it as, "the righteousness which avails before God" has already been mentioned with our reasons in 1:17. Moreover, that James in his Letter presumes the Pauline doctrine of justification adapts the Pauline terminology, and thus uses δικαιοῦν in the same sense as Paul and other Greek authors, does not need to be discussed further.

Therefore this δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ , "righteousness of God," which Paul praises in 3:21, and which counteracts sin, guilt and anger, is truly not our own righteousness nor something good in us, but it is a righteousness which rests outside of us, in God and His judgment. Consequently, it is as firm and unshakable as God Himself. What God says, judges or decrees, avails and has power and validity in time and eternity. Whom God declares righteous is righteous, even if the whole world and all the devils condemn him and his own conscience finds fault with him and condemns him. And this righteousness is now said to be "manifested," πεφανέρωται , namely, in and with the preaching of the Gospel. The perfect tense indicates that this is a completed fact, the effect of which still continues because the Gospel, which at that time had entered into the world, is continually preached. Ro 1:17 states that the righteousness which avails before God is "revealed," ἀποκαλύπτεται , in the Gospel; here it states that it has been made manifest, πεφανέρωται . "The verb φανεροῦν , "to set into the light," is different from the verb ἀποκαλύπτειν , "manifest" (1.17), with regard to the picture, not to the meaning. The latter is used concerning an object which had been covered by a veil, and which one makes visible by taking away the veil. The former is used concerning an object which is placed in a shadow and upon which one permits a ray of light to fall" (Godet). This "being revealed" does not stand in contrast to having been previously hidden in God's decree - this contrast is not indicated here, although it is expressly emphasized in 1 Pe 1:20, for example. The πεφανέρωται presupposes that the thing manifested was already present beforehand, even though in a hidden manner. Only that which exists is manifested. The righteousness of God existed, both before, as well as when, it was revealed. It was a reality, not only a potentiality. It did not need to be made real subsequently through the behavior of men. The judgment of God, which declares the sinner righteous, was passed and settled long ago. Now it is made manifest and known to sinners through the Gospel. Jesus Christ, whose name is mentioned in the following verse, has produced and established the New Testament righteousness. This gift is then offered and presented to men in the preaching of the Gospel.

According to the statement of the Lord in Luke 24:46-47, the decree of salvation of God, ἔδει , includes two elements. First, that Christ must suffer and rise again from the dead, by which the forgiveness of sins is merited and prepared. And, second, that in the name of Jesus repentance and forgiveness of sins must be preached among all nations, so that the available forgiveness might be made known and imparted to all nations through this preaching. This is also

the meaning of Paul in our passage because the righteousness of which he speaks is identical with the forgiveness of sins. "Without the Law," χωρὶς νόμου, this righteousness is and shall be manifested. The Law does not interfere with the Gospel. In the preaching of the Gospel God demands nothing of man, absolutely nothing, but only promises, gives and presents the New Testament blessings of righteousness. For the sinful, apostate world, this preaching brings entirely new tidings and wisdom, which never had come into the mind and heart of a single man. Nevertheless, in some measure it had been known by the Old Testament people of God. It is the ancient truth. The righteousness of which the Apostles speak and write was already witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets, that is, by the Scriptures of the Old Testament (Luke 24:27; Acts 28:33). The Apostle here points not only to such passages of the Old Testament which speak (nominatim) by name of that righteousness, such as Gn 15:6, Hab 2:4 and the previously quoted statements of the Prophets, but principally to the prophecies of the Old Covenant, which speak of Christ and the salvation of Christ. The salvation which is in Christ is essentially nothing else than the righteousness which avails before God. The expositors rightly point to the well-known dictum of Augustine, (Novum testamentum in vetere latet, vetus in novo patet), "The New Testament is latent in the Old, the Old is revealed in the New."

The principal concept of the sentence is again taken up in the following verse (v. 22) in order to add a modifier, "even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all (and upon all) who believe," δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. The concept of "faith" is made prominent here. The righteousness which the Apostle speaks of is the righteousness of faith. The sense of this statement remains unchanged even when one omits "and upon all," καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας, as do some ancient manuscripts. We retain the questionable words. As Meyer judges, "the doubled πάντας has caused the copier to leave them out." In 1:17, this righteousness is designated as δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, and here it is designated as δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is an absurdity which needs no refutation when Lange, Benecke, and some others take Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as (genitivus subjecti) a subjective genitive and speak of the faithfulness of Christ as the means of our justification. Apparently, πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is identical with the immediately following πιστεύειν, as well as with πίστις, as is plainly seen in 1:17; 3:25, 27, 28, 29, 30. In Ga 2:16, the expressions πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and πίστις Χριστοῦ, "faith in Christ," are explained by καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, "even we have believed in Christ Jesus," (cf. Ga 2:20; 3:22; Mark 11:22; Eph 3:12).

Man's faith in Jesus Christ is meant and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be taken as the objective genitive (genitivus objecti). But what is the relationship, indicated by the δὲ, between faith and the righteousness manifested in the Gospel? Modern expositors are satisfied for the most part by simply remarking that this righteousness is mediated through faith, and say nothing as to what extent the latter mediates the former. They indicate elsewhere that faith appears as the effective cause of the divine judgment of righteousness. But this assertion directly contradicts what Paul had expressed even in v. 21 concerning the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ. The Apostle presents the righteousness which avails before God as having been present before it was revealed, before preaching and faith. The preaching of the Gospel, which reveals and presents this righteousness, first renders faith possible and awakens it. Thus the meaning can be only this, that this righteousness before God is imparted to us and made our own through faith. The δὲ does not show the means of preparation or of acquisition, but the means of appropriation and assimilation. Thus Koerner remarks on our passage,

"The explanation is added by definition and exegesis, which and what kind that righteousness is, how it pertains and is applied to us. Faith is the medium by which this righteousness is applied to us"

[Adjungitur expositio per definitionem et exegesis, quae et quid sit illa justitia, et quomodo haec nobis contingat et applicatur. Fides est medium, quo haec justitia nobis applicatur.]

And Hodge says, "This righteousness is through faith, as it is received and appropriated by faith." In respect to justification, faith is solely, as the ancients call it, "medium of apprehension" (medium apprehendens, medium ληπτικόν).

Πίστις , πιστεύειν is confidence and reliance. The nearest object of πίστις in our passage is Jesus Christ, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός . Faith confidently takes, grasps, and apprehends Jesus Christ, specifically the Christ of whom the Gospel speaks and in whom is found the righteousness which avails before God. When a man embraces the Gospel, he appropriates to himself Christ and the righteousness which Christ has prepared which is manifested and presented to him in the Gospel. Through faith, the individual brings upon himself the pronouncement of the righteousness which avails before God. It is his own personal possession. And this is exactly God's purpose, within the ordinance of salvation, that man applies to himself the perfected righteousness which God has created for sinners through Christ and that man rejoices and comforts himself in that from the heart. The δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ is, therefore, as the second modifier states, determined for (εἰς) all who believe, similar to "to faith," εἰς πίστιν , (1:17) so

it is available and pours itself out as a stream upon all who believe. The emphasis lies on the double πάντας . Whoever believes, no matter who he is, whoever accepts what God offers, shall share thereby in this great blessing of the New Testament.

The following "for there is no distinction," οὐ γάρ ἐστι διαστολή , with its ensuing argument, is connected to "all those who believe," πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. Hofmann correctly demonstrates the connection of thoughts, "The Apostle speaks of those who have become believers in Jesus Christ, shows that no difference exists among them as far as their having become partakers of the righteousness, because they have all sinned and lacked the glory of God and have not become believers in any other way than that described in the participial clause." Hofmann is also right, when by "all," πάντες , he understands these to be same persons who are designated as "all those who believe," πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες. Luther is also correct, because he translates: "Sie sind allzumal Suender" and not "Alle sind Suender" ("all have sinned," A.V.). As Godet remarks, "The present participle δικάζομενοι refers to that moment, in the history of mankind, when a sinner comes to faith." All who believe have sinned before they became believers, and thus they have "fallen short," ὑστεροῦνται of the "glory of God," δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ ; that is, they have lacked the same. The genitive τοῦ Θεοῦ in δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ we take, analogously to the genitive Θεοῦ in δικάσυνη Θεοῦ , as the objective genitive (genitivus objecti) and therefore translate, "fall short of the glory of God." In John 12:43, the two genitives with the doubled δόξα mean the same thing, "they loved the approval of men rather than the approval of God," ἠγάπησαν τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ . It is contrary to the context to refer the δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ in our passage as either the future glory of God (of which the believers shall finally become partakers) or to the original image of God which man once had. All those who now believe have sinned and therefore were lacking in all praise, honor and esteem with God, in that they all, without exception have become righteous, δικάζομενοι , in the way and manner described in v. 24. In accordance with these remarks we take the δικάσασθαι as a middle voice (Luther: "and shall be justified"). Knowing their sinfulness and their complete unworthiness before God they have laid hold on Jesus Christ in faith, and therefore they have become righteous ones, who have God's judgment in their favor. Through faith they appropriate to themselves, in and with Christ, that complete righteousness which avails before God and is presented to them in the Gospel. Thus they have righteousness, and they are righteous and good before God.

Following this, in vv. 24-26, there is a lengthy statement on the manner and method of becoming righteous. All the emphasis lies upon this statement and the modifiers of δικαιούμενοι . It is characteristic of Paul's style that he often adds to a previous, less-stressed statement, principle thoughts, and important phrases of development in a participial clause or a relative clause. "They are all sinners, etc. is the chief part and center of this Epistle and the entire Scriptures." "They have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, in that they have freely become righteous by the power of His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Luther). First, it is made prominent that we have become righteous "as a gift," δωρεάν , and have in no way merited or earned this righteousness. The concept δωρεάν is strengthened by the second modifier, "by His grace," τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι , that is, by virtue of or by the power of His grace. The grace of God, χάρις , is, in the strictest sense, God's favor and grace over against sinners, as distinct from His love, goodness, etc. "God's mercy and grace are given impartially to the undeserving, as in Ro 3:24 where Paul says, 'We are pardoned and justified freely and out of pure grace.'" (Luther). The emphasized position of "His," αὐτοῦ , makes it noteworthy that we owe our righteousness only to God and His free grace, and in no respect to ourselves or to our own action. This disposition of God, His grace, is the motivation for our justification. The third modifier names the means of the justification, "through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus," διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρόσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἡσοῦ . This latter statement is not coordinated with, but subordinated to, the previous ones. According to His gracious disposition God has sent Jesus Christ as Redeemer of the world and has set Him an atoning sacrifice in order to justify sinners in this manner. It was noted in v. 22 that the righteousness which avails before God is imparted to us through faith in Jesus Christ. What Jesus Christ has to do with our becoming righteous is now unfolded further in vv. 24b-25. Jesus Christ has come and has redeemed sinners. From what? That is supplied from the context and from the entire first part of the Letter. There the Apostle showed that all men, Jews and Gentiles, are sinners and are under sin, that they are guilty and worthy of punishment before God, and can expect nothing else than the wrath of God. Thus from sin, guilt and punishment Christ has redeemed us. The verb ἀπολυτροῦν , and His derived substantive ἀπολύτρωσις are often found in the general meaning "free" and "liberate." This is its meaning in the passages which treat of the final redemption which comes on the Last Day, when God shall deliver His own from all evil (Luke 21:28; Ro 8:23; Eph 1:14; 4:30). But where the redemption from sin, guilt and punishment

is described, which Christ has merited through His suffering and death, ἀπο-
λυτροῦν or ἀπολύτρωσις is always used in its own, original meaning of "ransom"
and "redemption." Christ has redeemed us from all sins and from the wrath of
God because He paid the price or ransom, λύτρον . Christ Himself testifies
that He has come "to give His life a ransom for many," δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν
αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν (Mt 20:28; Mark 10:45). Paul says of Christ that He
"gave Himself as a ransom for all," ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων
(1 Tm 2:6) and "Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from every law-
less deed," ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν , ἵνα λυτρώσεται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης
ἀνομίας (Tit 2:14).

That in our passage the strict meaning of ἀπολύτρωσις (purchase, acquiring
through the payment of a purchase price) should be retained is proven also by
the synonymous terms ἀγοράζειν (1 Cor 6:20; 7:23), ἐξαγοράζειν (Ga 3:13)
and περιποιεῖσθαι (Ac 20:28). This terminology is derived from common human
relationships. It was customary to ransom prisoners of war from imprisonment
or slaves from slavery by making a ransom payment. Likewise through the payment
of a high price, Christ has ransomed sinful mankind from imprisonment for debt.
And what is this price, this ransom payment? According to the above-cited
Scripture passages, it is Christ Himself and His own life or, what is the same,
His own blood. We have in Christ "redemption through His blood," τὴν ἀπο-
λύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ (Eph 1:7; Col 1:14). St. Peter writes, "Knowing
that you were not redeemed (ἐλυτρώθητε) "with perishable things like silver
or gold from your futile way of life inherited from your forefathers, but with
precious blood, as of a lamb unblemished and spotless, the blood of Christ"
(1 Pe 1:18-19). Similarly, in our passage the blood of Christ is mentioned in
the relative clause which immediately follows. Because of their atrocities,
which Paul had enumerated in the first section of his Letter, men are "worthy of
death," ἄξιτοι θανάτου , (1:32) and, with their sins, have forfeited life.
But now Christ has come and given His life in their place, has shed His blood
for them, and thus sinful men are released from sin, death and damnation. Christ
Jesus is, as Paul has made prominent in the introduction of his Letter, the Son
of God, and is thereby God overall (Ro 9:5). The life and blood of the Son of
God - yes, God's blood, God's martyrdom, God's death, - is indeed the payment
and ransom price for the whole world. Paul proves that the redemption is present
in Christ Jesus, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ , not only that it has taken place through
Christ Jesus. This points to the remaining fruit - the continuing power and effect
of the redemption of Christ, which is indeed a unique, completed act.

The redemptive work of Christ is presented in the next relative clause (v. 25), which explains the previous statement from another viewpoint. "Whom God displayed publicly as a propitiation in His blood through faith," ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι . The expression "redemption," ἀπολύτρωσις , is taken from civil law; the other "propitiation," ἱλαστήριον , from the Israelite ritual of sacrifices. The first and foremost question is, "What does ἱλαστήριον mean?" Nouns of this ending designate a concrete thing, which have a meaning related to the action of the verb from which they are formed, such as χαριστήριον (a gift of thanksgiving) or νικητήριον (a prize of victory). Accordingly, ἱλαστήριον is something which is serviceable and appointed to ἐλάσσεσθαι , to expiate. When, in Biblical language, "expiate" designates an action relative to the relationship between God and man, it means "to bring it about that the sin of man ceases to be a reason for the anger of God against him" (Hofmann). In order to recognize what meaning Paul has assigned to the word in question, we must, above all, become acquainted with the biblical idiom. It is firmly established that in the Septuagint ἱλαστήριον is the usual translation of the Hebrew מִסְכָּנֶה, that is, the "mercy seat," which is the golden covering over the ark. Thus, for example, Ex 25:15-22; 31:7; 35:12, 37:7-9; Lv 16:2, 13-15; Nu 7:89. Twice the apposition ἐπίθεμα is found together with τὸ ἱλαστήριον (Ex 25:17; 37:6). "The exegetical axiom forms the basis that, when in the New Testament expressions of a religious nature which have already received a permanent meaning in the Septuagint are used, then it is wagered a hundred to one that it is used in the already fixed sense." In this case it is established that in Greek literature in general only two meanings can be proven for the noun ἱλαστήριον . In profane Greek, the meaning is that of "gift of expiation," but this is absolutely excluded in our passage. In the Septuagint, the meaning is "mercy seat." We are grammatically forced to take Ro 3:25 in the sense of "propitiation." Also, in the second passage in which the word is found in the New Testament (He 9:5), the meaning "Kapporeth," or "mercy seat," is apparent. In view of this assured linguistic conclusion, which is adapted by most of the church fathers, the old Lutheran and Reformed theologians, acknowledged by the recent ones, such as Tholuck, Philippi, Delitzsch, Ebrard, and Cremer, the objections against the comparison of Christ with the Old Testament mercy seat are hardly worth discussing and need no special refutation.

Since we correctly understand the designation of Christ as the "mercy seat," we must also consider the modifier "in his blood." Christ is the propitiation in His blood; or, by the power and virtue of His blood. We therefore combine

"through faith," διὰ τῆς πίστεως , as well as "in His blood," ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι , with ἱλαστήριον . For if one connects διὰ τῆς πίστεως to "displayed," προέθετο , and makes the Apostle say that God had put Christ forth by means of faith as propitiation, then, as Hofmann says, there is an "obvious contradiction." If, on the other hand, one joins διὰ τῆς πίστεως to ἱλαστήριον , then one must also, because of the grammatical parallelism, take "in His blood," ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι , as a modifier of ἱλαστήριον . Likewise it is meaningless when one says that God has presented Christ as propitiation by the power of His blood. For προτίθεσθαι means "present, put forward," and not "set up" as Philipppi and others translate it.

Christ appears as the antitype of the Old Testament mercy seat. So it is necessary that we see the meaning of the latter. Its expiating power and effect lay in the blood with which it was sprinkled every year. And since this blood was the blood of a sacrificial animal, we must first go back to the meaning of the Old Testament sacrifice. When an Israelite had sinned against one of the Commandments of God, then according to the regulations of the law he took an animal without spot or blemish from his flock and brought it to the tabernacle (later to the temple) and into the forecourt of the sanctuary. There he laid his hand on the head of the animal and thereby substituted the same for himself, and in a symbolical manner transferred to it his sin or guilt. That the laying on of hands had to mean that the animal was not only consecrated in general to the Lord, is clear from Lv 16:21, where it is prescribed that the high priest should lay both hands upon the head of the one sacrificial goat, "and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel ... putting them upon the head of the goat." Thereupon the Israelite killed the sacrificial animal. With his sin man had forfeited his life and merited death. Now in his place the innocent life of the animal was given over into death, the blood of the animal was shed. The animal, to which the sins of the man had been imputed, suffered the punishment of the sinner. At this point, the officiating priest entered into the sacrificial action. He took the blood of the animal and touched the same on the horns of the altar of burnt offerings, sprinkled it on the sides of the altar, or poured it out on the base of the altar, and thereby brought it near to God. For the altar was the place where God would come together with His people (Ex 29:42). The blood of the sacrificial animal came between sinful man and the holy God and atoned for the sin of man. Throughout the law, the power and efficacy to expiate sin is ascribed to the blood of the sacrifice. The Hebrew expression for "expiation" is כִּפּוּר . The verb כִּפּוּ , really "to cover" and is found only in the Piel and always in the

figurative sense of covering of sin and guilt. This כִּפֹּר "to expiate," is usually construed with כִּסֵּה as the verb of covering and mostly joined with a personal object (Lv 4:26,31,35; 5:6). However, it is also joined with an actual object, for example, Lv 4:35; 5:13,18. Nevertheless, it is the same, whether one presents this "covering," in the sense that the sin is covered, or that the man, or his soul, is covered with regard to sin. Psalm 32 declares the man blessed, "whose sin is covered," כִּסֵּה עֲוֹנוֹ ; literally, "who is covered with regard to his sin." The blood of the sacrifice applied to the altar of God covered the sin or the sinful man before God's eyes, so that God no longer saw, nor regarded his sins and no longer accounted them to him. For that very reason the blood served as the expiation of sin, because, in and with the blood, the life or "soul" of the animal flowed away and thus atoned for the punishment of the sin. Lv 17:11 reads, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood by reason of the life that makes atonement." When the flesh of the sacrificial animal or a part of it was kindled and burned upon the altar "for a sweet savor to God," this symbolized and proved that God was no longer angry at the sinful man, but looked upon him with eyes of pleasure. Self-evidently, the blood of oxen, goats and lambs did not have the power to expiate sin in itself, but could only point ahead to the better sacrifice of the New Testament. The basic idea of the sacrifice, therefore, was the satisfactio vicaria.

The significance of the sacrifice is basic for a correct understanding of the sprinkling of the blood by the high priest upon the golden cover of the Ark of the Covenant on the great Day of Atonement. The act of sacrifice on the annual Day of Atonement, which culminated in this sprinkling of blood, was "the highest and most perfect act of expiation of the Old Testament. "On this day all the sins of Israel during the entire past year were expiated" (Keil). "On this day shall the priest make an atonement for you to cleanse you; you shall be clean from all your sins before the Lord" (Lv 16:30). On this day the high priest should "make an atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly" (v. 33). The essential features of this great act of atonement are as follow. The high priest, clothed in white linen on this day, took a young bullock as a sin offering for himself and the priests and two he-goats as a sin offering for the people and placed them before the Lord - before the door of the tabernacle, later the temple. "Hereupon he killed the bullock of the sin offering for himself and the priests, then filled the censer with coals from the altar of burnt offering and both his hands with holy incense. He carried both into the Holy of Holies and there, by

laying the incense on the glowing coals, caused a cloud of smoke to arise. By this, the Ark of the Covenant, the place of the presence of God, was covered, so that he could safely draw near to it. While the Holy of Holies was filled with the smoke of the incense, the high priest went back to the forecourt. He took the blood of the bullock, then entered the Holy of Holies for a second time, and with his finger sprinkled (the blood) - first upon the front of the covering of the Ark of the Covenant, then seven times upon the ground in front of the Ark of the Covenant. By this he atoned for his sins and the priest's sins. The sprinkling on the Ark of the Covenant served to atone for the person of the high priest and the priests. The sprinkling on the ground before the Ark of the Covenant served to atone for and cleanse the Holy of Holies, because the remainder of the sanctuary had been made unclean during the past year by a sinful priesthood in the midst of a sinful congregation.

After the expiation of the priesthood had been completed, the high priest left the sanctuary the second time and went back to the forecourt. There he slew the goat which had been designated by lot as the sin-offering of the congregation. He then entered into the Holy of Holies for the third time with the goat's blood and sprinkled it in the same manner as he had sprinkled the blood of the bullock. The meaning of the twofold sprinkling of the blood of the goat is analogous to the twofold sprinkling of the blood of the bullock. First of all, it would atone for the sin which rested upon the congregation and, then, for the uncleanness of the Holy of Holies, which had passed over from the sin of the congregation because it was in their midst" (Koehler). Similarly, by means of the blood, the Holy Place, the forecourt and especially the altar of burnt-offering were cleansed of all the uncleanness of the Children of Israel. And so the service, which the congregation performed in and on the sanctuary through the priesthood, henceforth appeared clean, unblemished and God-pleasing worship again.

The chief characteristic of the offering on the great Day of Atonement is, therefore, that the blood of expiation was brought into the Holy of Holies and was sprinkled on the cover of the Ark of the Covenant. The contents of the Holy of Holies formed the throne of the God of Israel. The Ark of the Covenant, which contained the two tablets of the Covenant, was the foundation. The golden plate over the chest was the footstool of the throne. On this cover stood the two golden cherubim, whose wings were spread out above it and whose countenances were turned toward it. These cherubim are images of the heavenly cherubim. Between the cherubim, above their outspread wings, hung "the cloud of the divine glory, in which Jehovah manifested His presence in the Holy of Holies above the Ark of the

Covenant" (Kedl). Cf. Ex 40:34. Further in Ex 25:22, "There I will meet with you (Moses); and from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, I will speak to you about all things which I will give you in commandment for the sons of Israel. Also, in Lv 16:2, "I will appear in the cloud over the mercy seat (Kapporeth)." Thus, in that the high priest on the Day of Atonement applied the blood of the sacrifice to the mercy seat, he brought the blood into the immediate presence of God - he held it, as it were, directly under the eyes of God. Thus the blood of expiation had true value before God. The tablets of the Law in the Ark reminded Israel of their sins and transgressions and accused them before God. But between the tablets of the Law in the Ark and the holy God, who was enthroned above the cherubim, there was the blood-sprinkled mercy seat. Upon this, the countenances of the cherubim were turned and upon this the countenance of God was directed. The blood-sprinkled mercy seat covered the tablets of the Law and Israel's transgressions of the Law before the eyes of God, so that God no longer saw nor regarded them. When God thought about His Law and His peoples' transgressions of the Law, then He had to be angry with them. The mercy seat with the blood, however, changed the wrath of God into grace and pleasure. In the sacrifices of the great Day of Atonement, the thoughts of expiation and atonement thus found their strongest and most concrete expression in the golden mercy seat branded with the blood of expiation.

In order to fully understand the act of expiation of the great Day of Atonement, one must also consider what happened to the second sacrificial goat of the congregation. Koehler, after he had described the threefold entry of the high-priest into the Holy of Holies and the sprinkling of the blood of the first goat, says the following about this, "Herewith the real action of expiation was ended. What happened subsequently served to symbolize through an outward act that Jehovah would now regard all the sins and unclean acts committed during the past year as completely put away, so that the people should in no way seem burdened or blemished by them. For this purpose, high priest laid both of his hands on the head of the second goat, which had not been killed, as a sign that he applied something to it or laid something upon it. What this means is apparent from what the high priest did next. Over the goat, he confessed all the guilt and transgression of Israel according to the multiplicity of their failures and, thereby, laid them on its head. The goat was then led by an attendant out into the wilderness into a secluded place, taking the guilt far away from the congregation so that it could never again be brought back - the congregation was completely and forever free. Now, since the congregation had been already freed of their sins by the goat slain as an

offering of expiation (specifically, by the sprinkling of the blood of this goat), then the action through which Jehovah declared the congregation as free from their sins must have been completed. For the atonement of the sins of the congregation and the release of the congregation from their sins are not two different events. It is one and the same thing, but regarded from different sides or from different points of view. It was physically impossible to use the slain goat again to demonstrate the fact that the congregation, through the expiation had been completely freed of their sins. Therefore, another goat had to step into the place of the slain goat and symbolize, through that which happened to and with it, the release of the congregation from their sins, which had come as a result of the expiation. Accordingly, the two goats together formed only one single means of expiation of sin or sin-offering."

In our passage Christ appears as the antitype of the Old Testament mercy seat. At the same time, however, He appears as the counterpart of the Old Testament sacrifice. For He is the ἱλαστήριον by the power of His own blood, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι . All the types of the Israelite sanctuary and worship prophesy of Christ. Christ is, in one person the same time, sacrifice, priest and mercy seat. Christ Jesus has stepped into the place of sinful man and has taken upon Himself the whole world's guilt before God (Ro 3:19). Men have not enlisted this Substitute for themselves. They continue in their sins and have pleasure in them (Ro 1:32) and do not even desire a Redeemer, a Sacrifice for their sins. No, it is according to His own free grace, unasked and unpetitioned, that God has ordained and given His Son to mankind as a Mediator and Expiator. The expression "whom God displayed publicly as a propitiation," ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον , certainly includes the idea that God has designated and made Christ an ἱλαστήριον . The Lord placed all our sins upon Him - He imputed them to Him (Is 53:6). "He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf" (2 Cor 5:21). And Christ Himself willingly has taken all our sins upon Himself and imputed them to Himself (Is 53:4; 1 Pe 2:24). And, thus, He has offered Himself for us. He is at one time both sacrifice and priest. In place of sinful men, who were worthy of death (Ro 1:32), He has given His own life into death and has shed His own blood. With His holy, precious blood He has appeared before God Himself. He is our Mediator before the highest throne. He has made His blood available before God and has once atoned for our sins and the guilt of the whole world, and turned God's wrath into pleasure. Marked and sprinkled with His own blood, He stands as the real New Testament mercy seat between sinful men, the transgressors of the Law, and the great and holy God. He conceals all our sin, guilt, shame, and nakedness

before the eyes of God, so that God no longer sees them, nor regards them, nor reckons them to our account. Thereby, corresponding to the Old Testament type, mankind, on their part, are completely, thoroughly and eternally freed of their sins; freed, released and unencumbered of all their transgressions and uncleanness. That is what the expression ἑλασθήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι contains.

What the Apostle brings out as clearly and intelligibly as possible in Ro 3: 24-25 is, to speak with Ebrard, "the so often misunderstood and abused Biblical, Pauline, Petrine (1Pe 1:19; 2:24), and Johannine (1 Jn 1:29,36; Re 5:9ff.) doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ." Now he designates the vicarious satisfaction of Christ as the means of our justification. We are "justified through the redemption," δικαλούμενοι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως. First of all, Christ's redemption is a means of justification insofar as it is the causa meritoria. We are justified in that God, when He justifies the sinner, regards the holy, precious blood of His Son Jesus Christ, through which the guilt of the entire world has been expiated. Through this, sinful men are redeemed from sin, guilt, wrath and condemnation, so that God declares the sinner righteous for the sake of the bloody merit of Christ. "We are justified on account of Christ, on account of Christ's merit" (Justificamur propter Christum, propter meritum Christi.)

The comfort of justification consists not in that "the man lives in the delusion that sin would be forgiven in any case, or that God is not so exacting that His grace is self-understood" (Ebrard). Such delusion does not stand the test in temptation. The conscience of the sinner comes to rest only when it can say to itself that the guilt really has been paid and atoned for, the punishment really has been expiated and carried away. That we are justified through Christ's atonement and redemption says also that the righteousness which avails before God is actually affected and established. Christ's death and blood, His atonement and redemption are also the efficient cause of justification (causa efficiens justificationis). We must not think that, after Christ had merited and earned the grace of justification with His suffering and death, God only afterward justified man when man had fulfilled certain conditions. No, justification is the immediate effect of the bloody sacrifice of Christ. Christ placed His life and blood as a ransom for sinners and has offered Himself and appeared before God with His blood. This has the immediate result and effect that God no longer regards the sins of men, nor accounts their sins to them, but rather looks upon them with the eyes of pleasure. The non-imputation of sin, however, is materially identical with justification. Whom God no longer regards as a sinner, He looks upon as justified. Through Christ's death and blood the sinners are redeemed and released from guilt.

They are completely and eternally freed from sin, guilt and punishment, and certainly freed with regard to God's judgment and opinion. And what else is that than justification? Chemnitz remarks very aptly in his "Locis" in the article De Justificatione (pp. 314-315):

Christ is mediator and savior not only by merit but by his effective action. For he did not earn that through us or others the things might be effected which belong to our justification. But he effected and until now still effects those things, in which our righteousness and our salvation consists, such as the liberation from sin, the devil, death, and the wrath of God, and the application of these benefits. Thus he is deservedly called the efficient cause.

And further on: Christ did not obtain that we might be righteous before God unto eternal life by any other thing than the obedience or satisfaction of Christ. That is the very thing which is imputed to us for righteousness before God unto eternal life.

(Christus mediator et salvator est non tantum merito, sed et efficacia. Necque enim meruit, ut per nos vel per alios ea, quae ad justificationem nostram pertinent, efficerentur, sed ea effecit et adhuc efficit, in quibus justificatio nostra et salus nostra consistit, qualia sunt liberatio a peccato, diabolo, morte et ira Dei et applicatio horum beneficiorum. Et ideo merito vocatur causa efficiens. And further: Christus non meruit, ut aliqua alia re justissimus eorum Deo ad vitam aeternam, sed obedientia seu satisfactio Christi est illud ipsum, quod nobis imputatur ad justitiam, seu quod est nostra justitia coram Deo ad vitam aeternam.)

Likewise in this exact definition of "justification," δικαιούμενοι, , which describes the manner and way of our becoming justified, faith is referred to. Christ is called and is "a propitiation through faith," ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Here there can be no doubt that faith comes into consideration only as a medium apprehendens, for the atonement of our sins is complete by the fact that Christ shed His blood. It is not first caused by subsequent faith. It is a perfect atonement which Christ has accomplished. It needs no supplementing on the part of man but needs only to be appropriated by faith. The expression "a propitiation through faith," ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως, serves to confirm the prior concept of "the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ," δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Thus it is faith which applies to and claims for itself the atonement and redemption of Christ, the atoning power and effect of the blood of Christ, and the righteousness which avails before God. The distressed sinner takes his refuge by faith in Christ, the mercy seat, and there finds protection and covering against God's wrath and judgment.

The nearest object of faith is the Word to which the expression "displayed publicly," προέθετο, points. Before the entire sinful world, God has presented freely and openly placed, His Son Jesus Christ, whom He had made to be sin and the atonement of sin for us. Then He revealed Him as such, as a covering

of expiation and a mercy seat, through the preaching of the Gospel, which goes out into all lands. In the Gospel, the crucified Christ is portrayed before the eyes of men (Ga 3:1). The sinners here the Gospel of Christ, of His death, blood, and wounds, and in that they believe the Gospel, they accept Him. They become partakers of the benefit of Christ, His atonement and redemption, and, thereby, His righteousness which avails before God. In this manner they become devout and righteous before God.

To the relative clause "whom God displayed publicly," ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλαστήριον, the Apostle adds a statement of purpose, "to demonstrate His righteousness," εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ (v. 25). God has presented His Son Jesus Christ as a covering of expiation, whose atonement one can receive only by faith. This He is by virtue of His own blood, with the purpose of proving His own righteousness through this means. By the addition of this declaration of purpose, the position of "in His blood," ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, is explained, which would otherwise be expected immediately after "a propitiation," ἰλαστήριον, and before "through faith," διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Because God has decreed a violent death for His Son, that Christ shed His blood and, through His blood, atone for the sins of mankind, God wanted to manifest His righteousness. By presenting Christ with His blood and wounds before the eyes of man, He proved and demonstrated His righteousness before the whole world. The expression "the righteousness," τῆς δικαιοσύνης, in this connection, cannot mean that "righteousness of God," δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ discussed in 3:21-22 and 1:17. It cannot possibly mean the righteousness which avails before God, merited and presented by Christ for mankind. Since this does not speak of an offering or a revelation, but of a demonstration of righteousness, ἔνδειξις, only an attribute of God can be meant. Also, this is proven by the parallel expression "that He might be just," εἰς τὸ ἔλθαι αὐτὸν δίκαιον (v. 26). Therefore, with old theologians such as Quenstedt and Calov, and with most of the modern expositors, we understand δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ in our passage as the recompensing righteousness of God, as the Apostle described it in Ro 2:5ff., for example. By this, God recompenses everyone according to his works. His righteousness establishes itself in opposition to sinners as a righteousness of judgment.

Certainly, in and with the death of Christ, God wanted to prove His righteousness, and righteous judgment, because until that time He had overlooked the sins of mankind, "because in the forbearance of God He passed over the sins previously committed." In the time before Christ, God had overlooked the sins of the Jews

and Gentiles and had let them pass by unpunished. Πάρεσις ἁμαρτιῶν , "pass over sins," praetermissio peccatorum, is not the same as ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν , "forgive sins," remissio peccatorum. Because of the patience of God in the times before Christ, the sins of men had remained unpunished. The patience of God, ἡ ἀνοχή τοῦ Θεοῦ , is something other than the grace of God, ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ . The patience of God postpones the punishment, while grace suspends it completely. "For 4000 years the spectacle presented by mankind was a continual offense to the whole moral world. Apart from several great examples of punitive judgments, the divine righteousness appeared to be asleep; one could even ask whether it was existent. Man sinned on earth and still lived; man sinned again and prospered in security even to old age. ... This comparative impunity of sin had made a solemn declaration of righteousness necessary" (Godet).

Even if death, which is the wages of sin, ruled from Adam to Christ, still it was a "comparative impunity," and even proof of the patience of God, that sinful men lived securely and gayly in their sins for years and decades on earth before they died. For whoever sins is not worthy to live one day longer. Although the sins of mankind had remained unpunished so long, the righteousness of God demanded punishment for sin. Therefore, in Christ, in and with His death, God has finally solemnly manifested His righteousness. He previously overlooked sins "for the demonstration, I say, of His righteousness" (v. 26a). Even before Christ, while He permitted sins to go unpunished, He had His righteousness in mind and for the purpose of the New Testament times. Because the second use of the proof of the divine righteousness is introduced with πρὸς , not with εἰς, , as the first, and because in His declaration of purpose the divine proof of righteousness in the present time is made prominent, it appears to us most proper to connect the modifier "for the demonstration of His righteousness of the present time," πρὸς τὴν ἐνδεξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ νῦν χαρῇ with "pass over," παρέσιν , instead of taking it as a resumption of the purpose clause "to demonstrate His righteousness," εἰς ἐνδεξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ. . As Weiss correctly remarks, it makes no difference which way one refers the words.

What the Apostle says here of the proof of the divine righteousness is also an integral part of the Pauline-Biblical doctrine of the satisfactio vicaria. With His bloody sacrifice Christ has satisfied the righteousness of God, mainly the righteousness of wrath. The divine righteousness demanded punishment. And, now, in Christ, all the sins committed in the time before Christ, yes, the sins of all mankind of all generations, even to the end of the world, have been punished. The punishment of sin is death, death in the full sense of the word; death and

damnation. And now Christ has died the death of sins. He has died a violent death and has poured out His blood on the tree of the cross amid the most horrible torments and tortures. In this death, the wrath of God worked and ruled; Christ stood in the judgment of sinners. Thus He has given perfect satisfaction to the divine righteousness.

"Previously, the Apostle showed that, through Christ's death and blood, the sin of men has been expiated - sinners have been redeemed. That agrees very well with the assertion that, in Christ's death and shedding of blood, the righteousness of the wrath of God has shown itself. In Christ the sin of the world has been punished and atoned for, so that God no longer imputes it to man. It is a perversion when modern theologians set punishment and expiation opposite to each other and say that the one excludes the other and that God's righteousness demands either punishment or atonement. God's righteousness simply demands punishment of sin - nothing further. And punishment of sin in genere is certainly not identical with atonement for sin. If sinners are punished by death and condemnation because of their sin, even this can never atone for their sin. Even with the punishment of hell they cannot pay the last farthing of their guilt, but remain throughout eternity under sin, guilt and punishment, under God's wrath and judgment. For with their sin they have brought upon themselves an unending guilt. But the punishment of sinners, which lies upon Christ, truly atones for sin. Christ, the eternal Son of God, with His innocent, bitter suffering and death has taken away the punishment for sin. He has exhausted divine wrath and judgment. Thus the wrath of God, which was kindled against sinful mankind, has evaporated and man is now free, unencumbered, unburdened by sin, guilt, and punishment and by wrath and judgment.

In v. 24 the Apostle had named the grace of God as the motive for justification and, thereby, also of the redemption by Christ by which sinners are justified. Here, in vv. 25-26, he cites the divine righteousness as that which manifests itself in the suffering and death of Christ. But it is totally wrong to attribute redemption, atonement and justification in part to grace and in part to righteousness as the motive in God. This presents redemption as an agreement, or compromise between the grace and righteousness of God. No, what has moved God to redeem, justify and save sinners is exclusively His free grace. In v. 24, Paul names the grace of God solely as the causa impulsiva of our justification and redemption. In vv. 25-26, he says only this of the righteousness of God - that it had proven itself in the bloody death of Christ. It is foolish human speculation, when one deduces the redemption of sinners from the essence and

attributes of God and, thus, from His righteousness. The redemption of sinners was in no respect an act of necessity, neither a parte hominum nor a parte Dei. If God had condemned the sinful race of man without anything further and never thought of a redemption and salvation, then He would have remained what He was and is - the great, holy, righteous, good, upright, and perfect God. He would, thereby, not have denied His love. God had allowed men, His creatures, to experience His love in the fullest measure, and mankind had despised His love. They had not glorified their benevolent Creator as God, nor had they thanked Him. They were, therefore, guilty of death. It was a very special, as it were, unheard-of, unbelievable, entirely free impulse of divine love, which we call grace, that moved God to redeem the lost and condemned race of man and to save the irretrievably lost world. But certainly, since He has planned and carried out the work of redemption and salvation of sinners, God has not denied His righteousness nor laid it aside. That He could not do, otherwise He would have denied Himself. Rather, He had thereby given room in fullest measure to His righteousness and His righteous wrath which had been kindled against the sinners. That Christ, the Substitute for man who took upon Himself the sins of mankind, had to give His life and blood, was a proof of the divine righteousness. Where there is sin, there is also punishment - even when the sin is laid upon Christ. Righteousness demands that. The natural course of the demonstration of divine righteousness over against sinful mankind would have been that sinners themselves would have had to suffer and undergo the deserved punishment. But now the grace of God has intervened and has taken righteousness into its service. It has given the course of the demonstration of divine righteousness a different turn, so that its entire weight has fallen upon the holy Son of God. Consequently, sinful man no longer needs to fear the divine righteousness but can comfort himself in life and death, knowing that God is gracious to him and that even the holy, righteous God no longer has anything against him.

After this discussion, which was necessary to clarify the concepts of "grace," "atonement," and "righteousness" and place them in the correct relationship to one another, we turn once again to vv. 25-26, whose conclusion we have not yet taken into consideration. God has presented Christ as the covering of expiation. Christ is this by virtue of His blood, as a proof of His righteousness ... and for this final purpose, "that He might be just and the justifier of the one who has in Jesus " εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦν τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. God wanted to be both and to prove Himself as both. As the Just one He has

punished sin in Christ. As the One who justifies others, the sinners, He has atoned for the sins of mankind and has redeemed the sinners through the death and the blood of Christ, through the punishment exacted upon Christ. Therefore, men should also give Him the honor as the One who is and remains just, and who, at the same time, justifies the sinner. Thus the Apostle returns to the principal thought of the section: the justification of the sinner. Here he again mentions faith, which applies the atonement and redemption by Christ and the consequent justification. To "justifier," δικαλοῦντα, he adds "of the one who has faith in Jesus," τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ. The believers, who by faith appropriate Jesus and the righteousness which was merited and presented by Jesus and which avails before God, are really the justified; that is, those whom God regards as justified. Whoever does not believe, rejects Jesus and the judgment of justification which is pronounced by God in Christ over all sinners. He places himself outside of this judgment and is and remains "accountable to God," ὑπόδικος τῷ θεῷ. He remains under the wrath of God, which men have fallen under because of their sins.

In Ro 3:21-26, the locus classicus of justification, which is similar to the short passage of Ro 1:16-17, St. Paul shows with clear, plain words the counsel of God concerning our salvation and the way to salvation. They are plain and simple and yet very significant words, full of the power of God, full of Spirit and life, offered that sinful man might be born anew. Two examples of the effect of these words are appropriate here. First, there is the example of Luther. Luther writes,

"I had indeed been captivated with an extraordinary ardor for understanding Paul in the Epistle to the Romans. But up till then it was not the cold blood about the heart, but a single word in Chapter 1 [17], 'In it the righteousness of God is revealed,' that had stood in my way. For I hated that word 'righteousness of God,' which, according to the use and custom of all the teachers, I had been taught to understand philosophically regarding the formal or active righteousness, as they called it, with which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner.

Though I lived as a monk without reproach, I felt that I was a sinner before God with an extremely disturbed conscience. I could not believe that he was placated by my satisfaction. I did not love, yes, I hated the righteous God who punishes sinners, and secretly, if not blasphemously, certainly murmuring greatly, I was angry with God, and said, 'As if, indeed, it is not enough, that miserable sinners, eternally lost through original sin, are crushed by every kind of calamity by the law of the decalogue, without having God add pain to pain by the gospel and also by the gospel threatening us with his righteousness and wrath!' Thus I raged with a fierce and troubled conscience. Nevertheless, I beat importunately upon Paul at that place, most ardently desiring to know what St. Paul wanted.

At last, by the mercy of God, meditating day and night, I gave heed to the context of the words, namely, 'In it the righteousness of God is revealed, as it is written, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.'" There I began to understand that the righteousness of God is that by which the righteous lives by a gift of God, namely by faith. And this is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which merciful God justifies us by faith, as it is written, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.' Here I felt that I was altogether born again and had entered paradise itself through open gates. There a totally other face of the entire Scripture showed itself to me. Thereupon I ran through the Scriptures from memory. I also found in other terms an analogy, as, the work of God, that is, what God does in us, the power of God, with which he makes us strong, the wisdom of God, with which he makes us wise, the strength of God, the salvation of God, the glory of God.

And I extolled my sweetest word with a love as great as the hatred with which I had before hated the word 'righteousness of God.' Thus that place in Paul was for me truly the gate to paradise.

(LW 34, pp. 336-337).

Another proof of the impression which these words of Paul can make is the example of the noted English author Cowper, as related by Godet. At one time, Cowper had almost completely fallen into despair. For a long time he had paced back and forth in his room in passionate agitation. Finally he sat down at the window and when he discovered a Bible there, he opened it in order to try to find comfort and strength there. "The passage to which I opened," he says, "was Ro 3:25. When I read it, I immediately received the power to believe. The entire fullness of the rays of the Sun of Righteousness fell upon me; I saw the complete satisfaction of the atonement accomplished by Christ for my pardon and complete justification. In one moment, I believed and received the peace of the Gospel." "If the arm of the Almighty had not held me," he adds, "I believe I would have been choked by thankfulness and joy; my eyes filled with tears, emotion robbed me of my voice. I could do nothing except look up to heaven in quiet contemplation, full of love and amazement. Still it is better to describe the work of the Holy Spirit with His own words, "It was the joy unspeakable and full of glory" 1 Pe 1:8. Now, although such joyful excitement and emotion does not continue but gives place again to other moods, the words of Paul concerning the full satisfaction of Christ, of the righteousness which avails before God, can still give to the soul a peace which passes all understanding and which overcomes all temptations and even the terrors of death.

3, 27-31.

From the previous discussion, the Apostle in v. 27 draws an inference, "Where then is boasting?", ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις ;, "Paul thinks not only of the "boasting" (gloriatio) of the Jews, as he had in Ro 2:17ff., but speaks here

of "man," ἄνθρωπον (v. 28), of men in general. All men have by nature a proud heart and the instinct to boast about themselves and their own accomplishments. All such boasting "is excluded," ἐξεκλείσθη. And with what, by what means? "By what kind of law? Of works? No, but by a law of faith." The term "law," νόμος, is found here in its general meaning of "rule" or "ordinance," as also the Latin lex and the German Gesetz are often used in this wider sense. Certainly the "law of works," νόμος τῶν ἔργων, is identical with the Law in its usual narrower meaning of a "demand." The Law, or ordinance of God tells man what he should do and should not do; it demands works. And so by the Law, to be sure, the "boasting" of man is not entirely excluded. On the other hand, through the other ordinance of God, of which the Apostle had previously spoken, that is through the law of faith, all boasting, all occasion for self-praise is entirely cut off. Νόμος πίστεως is the ordinance of salvation, which is displayed in the Gospel, and, therefore, it includes faith. The Gospel speaks to man of faith, not in the sense that it demands faith as the Law demands works, nor that it demands at least this one work, faith, in contrast to the many works of the Law; but, rather, in the sense that according to this regulation man needs only to believe and accept that which God proclaims, promises, gives and imparts. And so faith, according to its essence and concept, principally excludes all boasting. It would cease to be faith if it would boast of any of its own actions before God.

This arises from the Apostle's previous commentary (οὖν, v. 27). But now he returns to what he had taught in vv. 21-26 regarding the way and manner of becoming justified. In a short summary, he concludes and proves these verses along with v. 27, "For we maintain that a man is justified by faith apart from works of the Law," λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. Evidently this sentence is a short summary of the Pauline doctrine of justification, and so very correctly it has become a sort of Shibboleth of the Lutheran Church, "therefore, we hold that man is justified without the works of the Law, through faith alone." That man through faith without the deeds of the Law is justified before God proves that he cannot boast of anything before God.

In this recapitulation of vv. 21-26, which expressly describes the mode of justification, faith is named as the only means of justification. But "Faith," πίστις, is a correlate concept and is not even conceivable without an object. Faith or trust must have an object, to which it holds and in which it confides. Faith always embraces its object. The object of faith, however, is precisely

the grace of God, the redemption which is present in Christ Jesus, the atonement for sins which was accomplished through the blood of Christ, and the righteousness which avails before God. To that faith clings, upon that it depends. "That faith's sole office and property is to serve as the only and exclusive means and instrument with and through which we receive, grasp, accept, apply to ourselves, and appropriate the grace and the merit of Christ in the promise of the Gospel" (FCSDIII 38). In that man, through faith in God's grace, applies and draws to himself the merit and complete righteousness gained by Christ, he is, in the eyes of God and according to God's judgment, righteous, good, perfect, and just. Since faith trusts in and boasts of nothing else before God than the free, undeserved grace of God - a work and merit not its own, but of Christ - therefore, all self-exaltation of man is excluded.

What it means that man is justified by faith, what is the extent that faith justifies; what there is about the justifying faith, how all merit or boasting of man is excluded the Apostle now makes even more clear and significant by adding, "apart from the works of the law," χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. Man is justified separate from the works of the Law. The works of the Law cooperate in no way and do not, even to the slightest degree, move God to speak a favorable judgment over the sinner. They are not even considered by God when He justifies man.

"That thereby they are excluded completely from the article of justification all of our own works, merits, worthiness, glory, and trust in any of our works, so that we might or should not view our works as either the cause or the meritorious basis of our justification which God takes into consideration in this article or matter, or rely on them, or make or regard them as entirely or one half or even only to the smallest degree factors in our justification" (FCSDIII, 37).

This modifying phrase, χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου, includes the fact that man is justified by faith alone. Man is justified either by faith or by works. But works are completely separated and excluded. Thus only faith remains.

Thus the sola fide, the "by faith alone" in Luther's translation, not only corresponds to the context but is given by the text itself. "We believe, teach, and confess that if we would preserve the pure doctrine concerning the righteousness of faith before God, we must give special attention to the "exclusive terms," that is, to those words of the holy Apostle Paul which separate the merit of Christ completely from our own works and all honor to Christ alone. Thus the holy apostle Paul uses such expressions as "by grace," "without merit," "without works," "not by works," etc. All these expressions say in effect that we become righteous and are saved "alone by faith in Christ" (FC Epit III, 3)

And Erasmus writes in his Liber concionandi III, "The word sola, abused with so great clamor in this century because of Luther, is reverently heard among the fathers" (vox sola tot clamoribus lapidata hoc seculo in Luthero reverenter in partibus auditur). Here the classical passage from Luther's Open Letter on Translation, in which he justifies his translation of Ro 3:28, deserves to find a place.

"I have received your letter with the two questions, or inquiries, to which you ask my reply. First you ask why in translating the words of Paul in Romans 3[:28], Arbitramur hominem justificari ex fide absque operibus, I rendered them thus: 'We hold that a man is justified without the works of the law, by faith alone.' You tell me, besides, that the papists are making a tremendous fuss, because the word sola (alone) is not in Paul's text, and this addition of mine to the words of God is not to be tolerated."

Here, in Romans 3[:28], I knew very well that the word solum is not in the Greek or Latin text; the papists did not have to teach me that. It is a fact that these four letters s o l a are not there. And these blockheads stare at them like cows at a new gate. At the same time they do not see that it conveys the sense of the text; it belongs there if the translation is to be clear and vigorous. I wanted to speak German, not Latin or Greek, since it was German I had undertaken to speak in the translation. But it is the nature of our German language that in speaking of two things, one of which is affirmed and the other denied, we use the word solum (allein) along with the word nicht [not] or kein [no]. For example, we say, "The farmer brings allein grain and kein money"; 'No, really I have now nicht money, but allein grain'; 'I have allein eaten and nicht yet drunk'; 'Did you allein write it, and nicht read it over?' There are innumerable cases of this kind in daily use.

In all these phrases, this is the German usage, even though it is not the Latin or Greek usage. It is the nature of the German language to add the word allein in order that the word nicht or kein may be clearer and more complete. To be sure, I can also say, 'The farmer brings grain and kein money,' but the words 'kein money' do not sound as full and clear as if I were to say, 'The farmer brings allein grain and kein money.' Here the word allein helps the word kein so much that it becomes a complete, clear German expression.

We do not have to inquire of the literal Latin, how we are to speak German, as these asses do. Rather we must inquire about this of the mother in the home, the children on the street, the common man in the marketplace. We must be guided by their language, the way they speak, and do our translating accordingly. That way they will understand it and recognize that we are speaking German to them.

Now I was not relying on and following the nature of the languages alone, however, when, in Romans 3[:28] I inserted the word solum (alone). Actually the text itself and the meaning of St. Paul urgently require and demand it. For in that very passage he is dealing with the main point of Christian doctrine, namely, that we are justified by faith in Christ without any works of the law. And Paul cuts away all works so completely, as even to say that the works of the law - though it is God's law and word - do not help us for justification [Roman 3:20].

But when all works are so completely cut away - and that must mean that faith alone justifies - whoever would speak plainly and clearly about this cutting away of works will have to say, 'Faith alone justifies us, and not works.' The matter itself, as well as the nature of the language, demands it.

Is it not much more 'offensive' that St. Paul himself does not use the term 'faith alone,' but spells it out even more bluntly, and puts the finishing touches on it by saying, 'Without the works of the law'? And in Galatians 1[2:16] and many other places he says, 'Not by the works of the law,' for the expression 'faith alone' is susceptible of another interpretation, but the phrase 'without the works of the law' is so blunt, offensive, and scandalous that no amount of interpreting can help it. How much more might people learn from this 'that they need not do any good works,' when they hear this preaching about the works themselves put in such plain, strong words, 'No works,' 'without works,' 'not by works'! If it is not 'offensive' to preach, 'without works,' 'no works,' 'not by works,' why should it be 'offensive' to preach, 'by faith alone'?

Just tell me: Is Christ's death and resurrection our work, that we do, or is it not? Of course it is not our work, nor the work of any law either. Now it is Christ's death and resurrection alone that saves us and makes us free from sin, as Paul says in Romans 4[:25], 'He died for our sins and rose for our justification.' Tell me, further: What is the work by which we lay hold of Christ's death and resurrection? It cannot be any external work, but only the eternal faith that is in the heart. Faith alone, indeed, all alone, without any works, lays hold of this death and resurrection when it is preached by the gospel. Why then this raging and raving, this making of heretics and burning them at the stake, when the matter itself at its very core is so clear and proves that faith alone lays hold of Christ's death and resurrection, without any works, and that his death and resurrection [alone] are our life and our righteousness?

Moreover I am not the only one, or even the first, to say that faith alone justifies. Ambrose said it before me, and Augustine and many others. And if a man is going to read St. Paul and understand him, he will have to say the same thing; he can say nothing else. Paul's words are too strong; they admit of no works, none at all. Now if it is not a work, then it must be faith alone."

(LW 35, 182, 188-89, 195-97)

This is the place to look more closely at the concept "works of the law," ἔργα νόμου, so that we might become well acquainted with what we must separate from the article and treatment of justification. By "the works of the Law," the Papists understand the works which God especially laid upon the Jews in the Jewish ceremonial law. These are no longer effective in the New Testament. But the "works of the law" are evidently all the works which God has ordained in the Law, above all those of the Ten Commandments or Moral Law, which are commanded of all men. Similarly, the Gentiles have a substitute for the revealed Law in the natural law. All these works are excluded from the article of justification and salvation. But not only the outward works and actions are ex-

cluded. "Apart from works of the Law," χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου and "not from works," οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, have often been interpreted that the empty outward works avail nothing before God; that God looks at the heart; that the disposition of the heart gives the true value to man and his works, even before the eyes of God; that when God justifies man, He accepts the good will for the dead. Like the papistic interpretation, this is nothing less than a gross perversion of the simple words of Scripture. To "the works of the law" belongs everything that God demands of man in his Law. Not only the works of the Second Table, but above all the inner works of the First Table. That man fears, loves and trusts in God, that he prays to, praises, and thanks God, all fall under the rubric ἔργα νόμου. Precisely these foremost works, which concern real worship, these inner works, motives and decisions of the heart, contribute nothing toward the righteousness which avails before God. The Apostle demonstrated, in the first part of the Letter, that man cannot possibly be justified by the work of the Law because both Jew and Gentile are sinners. The works of man are evil and cannot please God. Man does not and cannot do that which God demands of him in the Law. Also the apparently good works of the children of this world are an abomination before God, since they come from a heart that is estranged from and hostile to God. Even the truly good works of the regenerated, which Christians do in the power of the Spirit of God, are still weak, defective and imperfect and do not suffice before the eyes of God. God demands full righteousness. Besides this, the Christians certainly still sin very much every day. The good that they do cannot possibly outweigh or make harmless that which they do in a perverse and evil manner. Certainly, God looks at the heart. But even out of the heart of the Christians there still continually arise evil thoughts of which they must be ashamed before God. And so man's works and his conduct shall never cause him to stand as justified before God, "by the works of the Law no flesh will be justified in His sight," ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Ro 3:20; Ga 2:16). Therefore, according to God's decree of salvation, which indeed would have man justified and saved according to the Gospel, every work of the Law, both outward and inner works, both the natural works of the unconverted man and the spiritual works of the regenerated, are excluded from the judgment of God upon man.

With the expression "apart from works of the Law," χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου, the Apostle would separate the whole genus of "works," ἔργα, every human action and conduct, from justification. Everything that man thinks, wills, imagines and does, whatever it is or whatever it is called, is here excluded and

completely cut off. And so also faith itself, as a source or root and motive power of good works is excluded. It is a basic perversion of the Pauline-Biblical doctrine of justification when modern theologians say that God, when He justifies man, already sees in the seed, namely faith, the full fruit. But even when faith exercises its "sole office and property" by grasping and clinging to the grace of God and the righteousness of Christ, it is not considered by God in puncto justificationis that man, in this act, grasps the grace of God in Christ. It is not faith as a motive in the heart of man or an act of the human will it is not the act of apprehending which justifies man, but solely the thing apprehended.

"And whatever our activity may be in receiving Christ and accepting the divine grace offered and conferred, namely, after faith has been engendered in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, this does not come under consideration for its own sake when our justification is the matter under consideration, so little, in fact, that faith itself, inasmuch as it is an instrument, is rightly said to be opposed not only to all works of obedience and piety, but to faith itself and its virtue as our own work and action" (Calov, Systema X, 632).

(Et quicquid est activitatis nostrae in illa Christi receptione vel gratiae divinae oblatae et collatae apprehensione postquam nempe fides per Spiritum Sanctum producta est in cordibus nostris; id ipsum in censum non venit, cum de justificatione nostra agitur, adeo ut fides ipsa, quatenus instrumentum est, recte dicatur/opponi non tantum operibus omnibus obedientiae et pietatis, sed ipsi fidei, qua opus vel actus noster est ejusque virtuti.)

That which justifies man and moves God to declare man righteous is only and simply that which faith grasps and seizes - the object of faith. "The contrast is not between works produced by the Law and works produced by faith, but between works and faith, between what is done by us (whether in a state of nature or a state of grace) and what Christ has done for us" (Hodge). The concept "faith" here corresponds completely with "what Christ has done for us."

Thus, if we wish to stand before God in time and eternity, if we wish to be justified and saved before God, we must put far, far away from ourselves all of our works, thinking, feeling, willing, acting and working, whether it be called faith or bear the name of beautiful Christian virtues. We are lost if in puncto critico we reflect upon what we have done or our state of mind or if we take recourse to the fact that we meant it earnestly and uprightly with our Christian faith. On the other hand, these exclusive particles, "without the works of the law" and "not by works," are a great comfort for us, especially in the hour of affliction, such as the hour of death, when we shall be in great trepidation by looking back upon our life and conduct. According to God's Word

and will, according to the Gospel, we should look away entirely from our own thinking, imagination and actions. We can and should rest solely in that which Christ has done for us.

The statement of the Apostle in verse 28 is universally valid. We therefore hold that man in genere, ἄνθρωπον, is justified by faith without the deeds of the Law. The expression "man," ἄνθρωπον, is connected with the statement in vv. 29-30, which serves to establish and strengthen the general validity of the rule. "Or is God the God of Jews only?" This question implies another assumption which would have to be resolved, even if the general rule in v. 28 were not correct. But Paul emphatically rejects this assumption. "Is He not the God of the Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also." God is also God, Creator, Lord and Judge of the Gentiles, "since indeed God... is one." ὁ Θεός is a universal truth, also acknowledged by the Jews. And from this unquestionable axiom of the oneness of God, the Apostle draws a conclusion in the relative clause, "who will justify the circumcised by faith and the uncircumcised through faith," ὅς δικαιώσῃ περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. The "will justify," δικαιώσῃ, is also here the so-called logical future, which designates a present fact which is self-evident in the previously mentioned premise. If God is one God for all men, both Jew and Gentile, then it follows also that He justifies and saves all men, Jews and Gentiles, in one way, namely, by faith. It amounts to the same thing whether it reads "by faith," ἐκ πίστεως or "through faith," διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Faith is the means (medium, ληπτικόν) of justification, nothing else. It remains so also when one says ἐκ πίστεως. When a sinful man comes to faith, grasps Christ in faith, then as a result God regards him as righteous, because in and with Christ he grasps and appropriates to himself the righteousness which avails before God. The change of preposition, as we have already remarked above under Ro 1:17, serves only to draw attention strongly to the fact that everything depends on faith, that only faith is necessary, and that man is justified sola fide.

In our passage no difference between πίστις and ἡ πίστις is to be established. Also, πίστις without the article, as v. 28 shows, designates the specific saving faith - that is, faith in Christ, the fides justificans. The thoughts presented here, to speak with Luthardt, are "expounded by the Apostle with uncommon vivacity. They express a central point of the Pauline proclamation: The universality of salvation and the identical way of salvation for Gentiles and Jews, the point which he was obliged to maintain throughout his

life against his Christian adversaries. This he treats here with such a certain knowledge of victory that he considers an exhaustive demonstration of proof as unnecessary. But he permits blow upon blow to fall in short, elementary statements so that, thereby, the impression of the plain unquestionable truth should be strengthened... One God and one Mediator, one salvation and one way of salvation for mankind, which finds itself in equal wickedness - that is the Pauline preaching, that is Christianity itself!"

At the close of his instruction regarding justification by faith, the Apostle nevertheless raises the question in v. 31, "Do we then nullify the Law through faith?", Νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως . Do we, perhaps, make the Law, which is still God's Word and ordinance, powerless and invalid, in that we would be justified by faith alone, without the deeds of the Law? He rejects this question altogether with the words, "On the contrary, we establish the Law," Μὴ γένοιτο ἀλλὰ νόμου ἵστανται . He reserves for later the further proofs to how new obedience necessarily comes out of faith. Luther comments on v. 31, "Faith fulfills the whole Law, works fulfill not one tittle of the Law."

A summary of the entire presentation in 3:21-31 is: The Apostle teaches and testifies that man is justified without the deeds of the Law, to the exclusion of all his own boasting and merit. He is justified by grace alone, by virtue of the redemption of Christ, and this is the only way of salvation for all men, both Jews and Gentiles.

CHAPTER 4

ABRAHAM, AN EXAMPLE OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH

4:1-5.

Now, the Apostle brings father Abraham into the discussion. He asks how Abraham fares in this matter. Concerning the οὖν in the question, "What then shall we say?", Τὸ οὖν ἐροῦμεν, Hodge's remark applies: "The particle οὖν is not inferential, but simply indicates transition. 'What then shall we say about Abraham?'" "The particle οὖν universe inservit interrogationibus, ad quas antea dica invitant, simpliciter adnectendis." Grimm. The Apostle's previous explanation of the form and manner of justification, in regard to the fact that man is justified without the works of the Law by faith alone, occasions the question of how father Abraham fares.

First of all, the question arises as to how the words of the first verse are to be read. The old codices and translations offer four readings: 1) δ' AC and many old versions: Τὸ οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραάμ τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα 2) DFG and many old versions: Τὸ οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα 3) The Byzantine manuscripts: Τὸ οὖν ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα. 4) B: Τὸ οὖν ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραάμ τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα. The last reading, that of the Codex Vaticanus, stands entirely alone and cannot be considered even its hyper-ingenuous defense by Klostermann changes nothing in the status quo. The εὐρηκέναι, "has found," which is attested by all other manuscripts and all the versions, must always be maintained. But whether εὐρηκέναι originally stood behind ἐροῦμεν or behind ἡμῶν can never be determined with certainty and is of no consequence for the sense of the words. With the first case, one can combine κατὰ σάρκα "according to the flesh," (which stands emphatically at the end), with εὐρηκέναι. Similarly, there is no difference in meaning between τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν "our forefather," and the more documented τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν "our father." With most of the ancient and modern expositors we accept the third reading, which is in the textus receptus and which offers the

simplest, most natural position of the words.

But, now, what is the meaning of this question? Hofmann, Schott, and Luthardt place a question mark behind ἐροῦμεν and render this double question thus, "What shall we now say? Shall we say that we have found Abraham as our ancestor according to the flesh?" The first two take κατὰ σάρκα "according to the flesh," as modifier of τὸν προπάτορα, "the forefather," but Luthardt takes it as the modifier of εὗρηκέναι "has found." However, this interpretation, as Meyer and Weiss correctly judge, is prevented by the fact that in this case ἡμεῖς would be the subject of the second question. To ask whether we have found or received Abraham as our father or ancestor according to the flesh would be a very clumsy way to ask whether Abraham was or had become our father or ancestor according to the flesh. With most of the exegetes we take the words as a unified question, taking τὸν as object of εὗρηκέναι and drawing κατὰ σάρκα to εὗρηκέναι and translate accordingly, "What shall we now say, that Abraham our father has found according to the flesh?" What did he attain or win according to the flesh? When the Apostle here calls Abraham "our father," then, as Philippi, Meyer, and Weiss also take it, he includes himself with His Jewish-Christian readers, his fellow-countrymen, and points to the physical descent of Israel from Abraham. The Jews boasted of their father Abraham, and rightly so. Paul first mentions the spiritual fatherhood of Abraham in v. 11. Indeed, that which the Apostle originally states of father Abraham in verse 1 is very general. One expects further information as to what he really means with εὗρηκέναι and κατὰ σάρκα - and this he gives in what follows.

We translate further, "For if Abraham was justified by works," (v. 2). The sentence introduced with γάρ, serves to explain the foregoing. Evidently ἐδικαιώθη, "was justified," more clearly explains the εὗρηκέναι, "has found," and ἐξ ἔργων, "by works," the κατὰ σάρκα, "according to the flesh." What Abraham attained was justification, the righteousness which avails before God. The question now arises as to how he attained the great blessing, whether it was κατὰ σάρκα or, what is the same by works? The expression σὰρξ, "flesh," does not have an ethical meaning here. It does not stand in contrast to πνεῦμα, "spirit," nor does it designate the sin-corrupted human nature; rather, here it designates the human nature, as it often does. If anyone attains anything by works, then he attains it κατὰ σάρκα, in a human manner, by his own action and accomplishments. Here too the actually good works, which follow from regeneration, fall under the concept ἔργα. With ἐξ ἔργων, "by works," the Apostle also thinks of the good works which Abraham did after he had been

regenerated and had become a servant of the living God rather than a servant of idols, and of all the glorious virtues of which the Scriptures boast concerning father Abraham. Even the works of one who is regenerated, although they are accomplished in the power of God, are still the actions of a man; namely, the actions of a man who was regenerated. All the beautiful Christian virtues are simply human virtues, adornment and embellishment of the human nature. So the question is whether Abraham attained this blessing, justification, as a result of his good works. Certainly in this case, he must have rendered a perfect obedience, as the blind Talmud boasts that he had kept the entire Mosaic Law.

But now, instead of repeating the question with other words, the Apostle clothes what he adds in explanation of the same in the form of a conditional sentence and writes, *εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα* , "For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast about," He thereby makes it emphatic that in the assumed case in question, Abraham everywhere had *καύχημα* , materiam gloriandi, foundation and reason to boast. If he really was justified as a result of his works, then he has reason to boast of them, because he received something great by his own action. And certainly he can boast of them before God. If he truly became righteous before God through his works, then he has glory before God. The meaning which Philippi, Godet, Luthardt and others find expressed in the *ἔχει καύχημα* , that Abraham has praise "over against men," is contrary to the context. Then one must concede, as Philippi also admits, that "with this interpretation a general and more definite significance must be given to *δικαιοῦσθαι* ." But "according to the entire context no reader could understand *ἐδικαίωθη* except in the decided, solemn, absolute sense of the Apostle," namely, of the righteousness which avails before God (Meyer, Weiss). Certainly the thought that Abraham, in the assumed case, had praise only over against man and not over against God is unavoidable when one combines the following *ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* "but not before God," immediately with *ἔχει καύχημα* and takes it as a second part of the apodosis. The interpretation of Meyer that Abraham, if he had been justified before God by works, had praised before God, but not praise in relation to God, and could not then boast of the righteousness as a benefit received from God, is much too artificial and far fetched. Still this construction is very questionable. According to the entire context one expects an answer to the question raised in v. 1, and whether the hypothetical case in v. 2 really is a rejection of that question and its result. Such a rejection lies in the words *ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* , if with Calvin,

Calov, Reich, Fritzsche and Weiss we detach them from ἔχει καύχημα and take them as an independent statement. We therefore take πρὸς τὸν θεόν as an oath (which would have to read πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ), in the sense of secundum Deum, in conformity with God, in conformity with the judgment of God. Hofmann's interpretation amounts to the same thing. He interprets the words ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν thus: But No, this is actually not the case; in truth, Abraham has no praise before God, he is not justified by works, nor in conformity with the judgment of God according to that which God judged the form and manner of his justification. For it reads in v. 3, that the Scriptures say of Abraham that he believed God, and that it was counted to him for righteousness. The Scriptures testify of Abraham that he had been justified in no other way than by faith, thus not by works. In the scriptural testimony, God's judgment regarding Abraham, is presented. Thus according to the Scriptures, Abraham was not justified as a result of his works and therefore he has no praise before God. Thus the Apostle arrived at the principal statement on which his explanation from v. 1 was aimed, namely, that father Abraham was justified before God in no other way than that previously described, in which alone sinners, be they Jews or Gentiles, are justified before God, that also father Abraham had been justified without the works of the Law, alone by faith. Paul desires to present Abraham as an example of justification by faith.

The Scripture quotation introduced in v. 3 is Gn 15:6, the Old Testament locus classicus of the doctrine of justification. The Lord had appeared again to Abraham in a vision, had led him out into the open spaces, had shown him the numberless host of the stars, and said to him: "So shall thy seed be." That was an unbelievable statement. For Abraham at that time still had no physical son and heir. But Abraham believed God אֲבְרָהָם אֱמָן . He rested firmly upon, depended on, trusted in the Lord, who had given him so great a promise. The Greek corresponds exactly to the Hebrew expression. Abraham believed God, trusted in that which God had said to him. And just this faith the Lord accounted to him for righteousness, אֲבְרָהָם אֱמָן לְיָ . The Greek translation only transposes the active into the passive: καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην , "and it was counted unto him for righteousness."

Here in Ro 4:3, as further in vv. 5.6.8.11.22.23.24 in the same chapter, one finds the characteristic expression λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην , resp. λογίζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην . Like δικαιοσύν , this marks the justification as an actus forensis, as a judgment of God. In his large exegesis of Genesis Luther has translated אֲמַן with "remember," in that he remarks that it makes no dif-

ference whether one reads "account to one" or "remember." The λογίζεσθαι indeed falls under the rubric "the thoughts of God," "which deceive nor fail no one." The righteousness with which we stand before God in life and death is not a righteousness which is inherent in us, but a righteousness which is found outside of us in God's heart and thoughts. I am righteous, "if the divine majesty thinks of me as righteousness, that my sins are forgiven." Now we must more closely examine this important concept λογίζεσθαι, λογίζεσθαι. The word λογίζεσθαι which in the Scriptures is often used with the derived meaning ["join," "reflect on," "ponder," "consider," "suppose," "hold as an opinion," originally meant "account," "compute." It has this strict meaning in Ro 4, in the quoted passages. Λογίζεσθαι τὸ τινι means: "To account something to someone, to place in reckoning, either for something for which he has to bear the blame, or for what is beneficial to him" (Cremer). Hodge remarks: "The primary meaning of the word λογίζεσθαι ... is to reason, then to reckon or number. ... In strict connection with its primary meaning, it signifies to impute, to set to one's account, that is, to number among the things belonging to a man, or chargeable to him. It generally implies the accessory idea of treating one according to the nature of the thing imputed. ... It produces no change in the individual to whom the imputation is made; it simply alters his relation to the law. All these objections, therefore, to the doctrine expressed by this term, which are founded on the assumption that imputation alters the moral character of men; that it implies an infusion of either sin or holiness, rest on a misconception of its nature. So far as the force of the term is concerned, it is a matter of indifference whether the thing imputed belonged antecedently to the person to whom the imputation is made or not. It is as common and correct to speak of laying to a man's charge what does not belong to him as not changing what does. That a thing is seldom imputed to a person to whom it does not personally belong is a matter of course. But it is a misconception to say that the word itself implies that the thing imputed must belong to the person concerned. These remarks have, of course, reference only to the meaning of the word. Whether the Bible actually teaches that either sin or righteousness are imputed to any to whom it does not personally belong is another question. The Bible does speak both of imputing to a man what does not actually belong to him, and of not imputing what does, as the following, passages indicate: Lv 17:3,4: 'What man soever killeth an ox, and bringeth it not to the door of the tabernacle... blood shall be imputed to that man;' that is, blood-guiltiness or murder, a crime of which he was not actually guilty, should be laid to his charge, and he should be put to death.

... 'as blood-guilt should it be accounted to this man' (Gesenius). On the other hand, Lv 7:18, if any part of a sacrifice is eaten on the third day, the offering 'shall not be imputed to him that made it.' It is said of God that He does not account to man the sins which he has committed, of which he is really guilty: 2 Cor 5:19: μὴ λογισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα ; Ro 4:8: ὧ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν ; 2 Tm 4:16: μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθεῖν . On the other hand we read in Ro 4:11: Εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς δικαιοσύνην also to the Gentiles, who have no righteousness, shall righteousness be accounted.

A special manner of speech is: λογίζεσθαι τί τινι εἰς τι לִּי עָלַי with לִּי עָלַי and double accusative, or passively: λογίζεσθαι, λογισθῆναι τινι εἰς τι לִּי עָלַי with a double לִּי עָלַי . That means: Ita aestimatur aliquid, ut sit aliquid, i.e. ut valeat pro aliqua re, s. tribuitur alicui rei vis et pondus rei (Grimm, Fritzsche). In Ps 106:31 it is said of Phinehas: $\text{וְיָדָהּ ה' וְיִשְׁמַח בְּעֹלָתוֹ וְיִשְׁמַח בְּעֹלָתוֹ}$ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην etc. That means, as also Hengstenberg judges: The act of Phinehas reported in Nu 25:12, which was murder according to the outward appearance, was regarded by God as righteousness, as a good, holy work, and was rewarded in that the high priesthood was entrusted to him forever. Here the discussion is not concerning the solemn righteousness which Paul describes in Ro 3 and 4. In Ro 2:26 we read: οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται , i.e., a Gentile who is actually not circumcised shall be regarded as circumcised if he fulfills the Law. In reference to these and similar passages Cremer writes: "That for which the word is also completely suitable (λογ. τι εἰς τι), does not bring the reality into consideration. Rather the opposite is assumed: the conduct or behavior is adjusted to what is imputed. Something is conferred on the subject concerned and accounted to him in which and by itself is not his, in answer to: λογίζεσθαί τί τινι εἰς τι , something is brought to the person's account per substitutionem. The present object takes the place of the one to whom it applies, it is substituted for him." And thus he explains the sentence ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην , in Ro 4:3.5.9.22: "Faith takes the place of righteousness." To Abraham his faith was accounted as righteousness though in itself it was something else. The faith of Abraham had vim et pondus iustitiae. Abraham, who possessed no righteousness of his own which satisfied God, was nevertheless regarded and treated by God as righteous when he believed God. Accordingly it is the same, whether one reads that to Abraham his faith was accounted for righteousness, or that he was justified by faith.

But we must also be mindful here of that which we said above regarding the judgment of justification, that it is no empty fictio "no empty imaginatio," but

but has a foundation in reality. It was no arbitrary act that God accepted the faith of Abraham for righteousness. We must still discuss in detail the question: Why and how far Abraham's faith was accounted to him for righteousness. Tholuck, Olshausen, Neander and others find the basis for this in the moral worth, the moral quality of the faith of Abraham. This God-pleasing disposition, his intimate trust in God, was accepted as a complete fulfillment of the Law. One supposes that only with regard to its nature but not for its content does the faith of Abraham correspond to the faith of the Christian. So also Weiss, and even Keil, who remarks on Gn 15:6: "This righteousness Abraham received through his unconditional trust in the Lord, his undoubting faith in His promise, and his willing obedience to God's word." Against this interpretation Philippi correctly protests: "If according to Paul's opinion this faith had justified Abraham with respect to a subjective disposition of the mind, a spiritual good conduct, some God-pleasing virtue, then the Apostle would have thereby cut off the core of his doctrine of justification. For we understood Paul to say that faith justifies man before God not for the sake of its subjective nature, the latter being a legalistic viewpoint. Faith only justifies a man for the sake of its object and content, which is nothing else than Christ's or God's forgiving grace in Christ. Abraham also knew and grasped in faith the promise of this grace and so his faith was counted to him for righteousness." Delitzsch agrees essentially: "Not just any outward legal work, but faith justified Abraham, at that time still the uncircumcised one, before God - a pre-Christian scriptural testimony for the fact that man attains a righteousness which avails before God not in the way of the Law, but in the promise which brings to him salvation. This righteousness, far from being self-effected, has its foundation and grasps the proffered salvation in Christ. Likewise the promise which passed upon Abraham has Christ as its goal (sub innumerabili illa posteritate latebat Christus, remarks Hunnius). The faith by which he accepted is faith in the promised Seed, and Jahve, in whom Abraham rested in faith, is God the Redeemer." Meyer also emphasizes that the justifying power and significance of the faith of Abraham did not lie in its subjective nature, but in its content. That is not "dogmatic" exegesis or eisegesis. It lies in the text itself. In Gn 15:6 the emphasis lies on the fact that Abraham believed what God had spoken to him, he specifically believed and obeyed the word of God with its promise; that was counted to him for righteousness. Luther remarks on Gn 15:6: "Thus it says here clearly and significantly what faith in itself alone does and works, and not with what kind of virtues or works it is surrounded or adorned. By itself alone faith grasps the promise, believes God in the promise, and since God offers

and gives it something, it stretches out its hand and takes. That alone is the proper work of faith." The content of the promise which Abraham had heard was Christ. It is this that: "under that innumerable posterity Christ was hidden," (sub innumerabili illa posteritate latebat Christus). Through the one Seed, Christ, should Abraham gain that numberless seed out of all nations. Through the one Seed, Christ, should the blessing come upon all nations. And according to the first Gospel in Gn 3:15, this blessing should consist in the redemption from the devil's power, from sin and death. In and with the promise Abraham grasped the future Christ, and the salvation in Christ. And precisely this faith, which had such content, was accounted to him for righteousness. The freedom from sin, the righteousness which was to be supplied through Christ, which he appropriated to himself in faith, was accounted to him by God as his own righteousness.

The Apostle adds to the scriptural testimony concerning Abraham in vv. 4.5 with the metabatic $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, as explanation: "But to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Paul had attested from Scriptures that Abraham's faith had been counted for righteousness, and therewith he proved that Abraham had not been justified by works, and thus had no praise. He presumes it as settled that faith and works are not compatible with one another, that there is here only an either-or, that man is justified either by works or by faith, tertium non datur. Since the thought lies so close that Abraham, concerning whom the Scriptures report so many and excellent works, might have received something by his works, therefore he calls attention to the diametrical contrast between work-righteousness and righteousness by faith with express words. It follows that with Abraham, who had been justified by faith, the opposite, the justification by works, was entirely excluded. Meanwhile the Apostle no longer speaks specially of Abraham, but advances two generally held antithetical statements, which appear as loci communes. It is not an historical question which he discusses, in that he asked how it had gone with father Abraham. With the example of Abraham he wants to teach, to confirm his previously presented doctrine, and would present Abraham before all future generations as an example of faith and of the righteousness of faith.

It is first of all an axiom from ordinary life which Paul introduces here: $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\ \acute{\omicron}\mu\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\upsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\nu;\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\mu\alpha.$
To a worker who wants to earn something with his work, who feeds himself with the work of his hands, will his work get a reward not according to grace, but

according to indebtedness, as a merited reward. It is no favor or grace which his employer shows to him when he pays him his wages, but he gives him only that which he owes him. But now the Apostle evidently wants this universally valid axiom applied to the present question regarding justification. Therefore ὁ ἐργαζόμενος is one "who deals only in works" (Luther), "a doer of works, to whom the works are the essentials of his life" (Philippi), a man who seeks to fulfill the works which God demands of man in His Law, and who would thereby appease God. To the account of such a man God, presuming that he has perfectly fulfilled the Law, places the benefit about which the discussion is here, i.e., righteousness, not according to grace, but according to what is owed. It is no proof of the divine grace but simply an act of divine righteousness when God looks upon and treats a man as righteous who has fulfilled all the righteousness of the Law. Of course, that is a situation that never takes place in reality.

The antithesis reads: τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην . The object of faith is here designated with a singular and significant expression, which most expositors have more or less left unexplained and disregarded. As the object of faith and trust there appears here the One who is called "the One who justifies the godless." As in Ro 3:28 with ἄνθρωπον , so here is meant by τὸν ἀσεβῆ man in genere. Man according to form and nature is ἀσεβῆς , a godless one. One would have expected as correlate to δικαιοῦντα and to λογίζεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην the designation τὸν ἄδικον . But deliberately the Apostle chooses the stronger expression τὸν ἀσεβῆ . Man has not only infringed upon the divine right, denied God the due obedience, but he has deprived Him of the rightful εὐσέβεια , the due respect, the due honor, by not acknowledging Him as God, as his God, and being hostile to God. Now the godless man stands before God, before God's judgment, and must be prepared for nothing else than for the judgment of condemnation. But what does God do? Instead of condemning the godless, He justifies him; through His decree He declares him righteous. In His Law God reproaches human judges in that they declare the godless righteous (Pr 17:15), upon such acts God places His honor and His praise. He claims for Himself the right to acquit the godless man. The same situation is pictured here, e.g. Gn 3:15; Is 1:18. The first human beings were drawn into account by God and were convicted of their sin and transgression. Nevertheless God promised them redemption from sin. Israel stands before God's tribunal laden only with blood-guilt. How does the Lord speak? "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be as crimson, they shall be as wool." Certainly, God is "not a God

that hath pleasure in wickedness" (Ps 5:5). God is and remains under all circumstances the holy and just One. He concedes nothing of His holiness and righteousness, when He declares the godless righteous. The Apostle had previously sufficiently attested that God justifies the sinner through Christ, that Christ has atoned for all the godlessness of mankind with His blood and thus satisfied the divine holiness and righteousness and quieted the wrath of God. Thereby the contrast between the nature of man and the judgment of God is not made more tolerable to the human reason. It was God Himself who sent His Son into the flesh and presented Him as ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ . Indeed, He is a wonderful God who has revealed Himself in Christ in the Gospel, as the God who justifies the godless.

There is no rational explanation for this wonderful judgment of God. Nothing that is in man moves or causes God to declare the godless as righteous. Not even the faith of man. To be sure, precisely in our passage the Apostle characterizes faith as the fides justificans, but in such a manner that every thought of a dependence of God's justifying judgment upon the faith of man is excluded. In the phrase πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἄσεβῃ the δικαιοῦν of God appears as the logical prius, faith as the logical posterius. That wherein faith trusts, depends, is already there, is present, when faith leans upon it. That which faith takes and grasps is a ready, prepared gift. "Faith means to take what is there." (Cf. Synodalconferenzbericht of 1872.) One does not explain correctly what the Apostle writes here, when one explains it thus, that the believer looks confidently to God that He will justify him. No, that God justifies the godless is presented here as an established fact, which stands firm before faith and independent of faith. And faith looks confidently to this established fact, accepts this fact. In Christ, through Christ, when He gave Christ into death, God had already declared the godless man righteous in general. Thus He has proven Himself as a God, and thus He is a God who justifies the godless. It is an attribute of God -- δικαιοῦν τὸν ἄσεβῃ . This judgment of God as well as God who judges thus are made known and presented to godless man in the Gospel. Whoever believes that, believes the Gospel, accepts the judgment of God which is offered in the Gospel, and he looks confidently to God who thus judges and has judged.

In this passage also faith stands in contrast to works. The believer is described as one who does not go about with works, but rather he believes in God who justifies the godless. Whoever believes, when he steps before God and deals with God, leaves all his works behind, because he has recognized that with his works, even with his best works, he cannot stand before God. He places himself

as a godless one before God and looks confidently to the God who justifies the ungodly. Such faith, as the Apostle writes, shall now be counted to him for righteousness. Here it is completely evident how far faith is accounted for righteousness. Not insofar as it is a good work or a beautiful virtue, a God-pleasing disposition, or a general behavior of man, for the πιστεῦειν stands in contrast to ἐργάζεσθαι whoever believes in the God who justifies the godless, recognizes and acknowledges himself as a godless one—but only for the sake of its object, upon which all emphasis lies in this statement. In the expression ἡ πίστις λογίζεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, faith appears as the logical prius and the becoming righteous as the logical posterius. That does not contradict what we have previously said regarding the relationship of πιστεῦειν to δικαιοῦν τὸν ἄσεβῃ. The matter is as follows: God has already declared the godless in genere righteous in Christ, and therefore He is θεὸς δικαιοῦν τὸν ἄσεβῃ. This judgment of justification, which is pronounced in the Word of the Gospel, I apply to myself through faith for my own person, in individua. And so God holds and accounts me specially for my person, as a righteous one. To this thought the Formula of Concord gives expression in the following words: "We believe, teach and confess that faith alone is the means and instrument, whereby we lay hold of Christ and thus in Christ of that righteousness which avails before God [which thus is present before faith, lies prepared in Christ for all men], for whose sake this faith is imputed to us for righteousness" (Ro 4:5; Triglotta, p. 793).

What the Apostle attests here applies not only to the so-called first justification, with which man steps out of the condition of sin into the condition of grace, but has its validity and meaning for the entire Christian life. Paul writes his Letter to Christians, who already for a shorter or longer period of time stand in grace, and he gives them to consider how man in general, even after he has become a Christian, is justified before God, in what manner alone man can stand before God even in the hour of death and in the judgment. Justification permeates the entire Christian life. The "not by works, but by faith alone" is the vademecum, the daily food and nourishment, of a Christian. And precisely the element which is emphasized here, that God justifies the ungodly is the comfort of our faith in life and death. Even if a believing Christian is not godless in the sense of the impenitent, unbelieving children of the world are ungodly, still the longer he recognizes it, the more he recognizes it, how much sinfulness, estrangement from and hostility to God there is still hidden in his heart. And therefore he clings in faith to this very word, that God justifies the ungodly. Faith does not conclude thus: I believe, I know within myself that I heartily

believe in my Savior. Therefore I am righteous before God. A believing Christian does not feel his pulse, does not make the pulse-beat of his life of faith into a criterion of his condition of grace. He would thereby fare badly. For faith often forsakes its own feelings and experiences, and it is often troubled over the question whether his faith is really the right kind. Faith rather concludes thus: O, how ungodly I still am! Out of my heart such wicked, godless thoughts still continually arise. In that there is no doubt that I am still a poor, unworthy sinner. My sin is ever before me. But now God's Word says to me that God even justifies the sinners, the ungodly. Thus without a doubt I belong to the number of those whom God justifies. Indeed all sinful men should draw this conclusion. That most do not do that comes from the fact that they do not believe the Word and they ask nothing about God and the righteousness which avails before God. It is known, as Luther deduces in his Pentecost sermon on John 3:16, the certainty of salvation from the words: "For God so loved the world," especially from the word "world": "Now one can suppress unbelief with nothing else than with the Word of God. Our dear Lord Christ Himself preached that to us, so that we have no reason to doubt such preaching and word. Christ said that His Father in heaven, the real, eternal God, loved the world so that He gave it His only begotten Son. Now you and all men must recognize that the world does not mean Mary, Peter, and Paul; but the world means the entire human race in one body, through and through. Do you believe that you are a human being? Or if you cannot believe or know such a thing, then grasp yourself upon the breast or on the nose, whether you do not also have flesh and blood like other people. Why would you then exclude yourself from this 'world,' because Christ states with clear lucid words, that God has not given His Son only to the blessed Virgin Mary, nor to St. Peter, nor to St. Paul, but to the world, so that everything that is called children of men should receive Him who is Christ." Similarly one can and should also apply 4:5: Do you believe that you are a sinner? Or if you cannot believe such, then only reach and look into your heart, how wicked and corrupt it still is. Why would you exclude yourself from the word 'ungodly'? But now God's Word states clearly that God justifies the ungodly. Thus also you!

Finally, when one compares the two statements in v. 4 and v. 5, then one discovers that the two members of the antithesis do not correspond exactly one with the other. The antithesis in v. 5 should properly read: But to him who does not work but believes to him the blessing of righteousness is accounted not as a debt, but according to grace. Nevertheless the incongruence remains only in form, not in the content of the apostolic statement. The κατά χάριν, the

two following expressions. To forgive sins, ἀφίεναι, means to take the sins away. Certainly it is impossible to undo the evil which one has committed. The sin remains and works afterwards in its results, as was the case in the two-fold sin of David. But the forgiveness covers the sins before the eyes of God, "so that they appear invisible before God, the Holy One, and are as if they had not happened" Delitzsch. Therefore it reads further: καὶ ὧν επεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. This figurative expression "cover" is then illustrated by the real expression: Μακάριος ὁ ἀνὴρ ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν. "How blessed is the man to whom the Lord does not impute iniquity," will not bring into account, "in that He rather looks upon it as cancelled, as done away with" Delitzsch. With the three parts of the sentence of Ps 32:1.2, which paraphrase the concept "forgiveness of sins," Paul wants to prove that according to David's statement righteousness is accounted to the sinner without works.

V. 6 Thus imputation of righteousness is entirely synonymous with non-imputation of sins, forgiveness of sins. And so our Confession is correct, when it defines the justificatio thus: "We believe, teach, and confess that according to the usage of Holy Scripture the word justify means in this article, to absolve, that is, to declare free from sin" (Latin quote - Triglotta p. 793). [Credimus, docemus, et confitemur, vocabulum justificare in hoc articulo idem significare, quod absolvere a peccatis.] It is confusing and misleading, if one makes an actual difference between justification and forgiveness of sins. One to whom his sins are forgiven is without sin, pure, and righteous before God, just as God would have him. "This word (Ps 32) shows abundantly how Paul understands justification. Not as a moral transformation of man, neither as a divine acknowledgement of a corresponding moral condition of man, but identical with the forgiveness of sins, thus as an acceptance of man in the eyes of God in spite of a non-existent corresponding moral condition" Luthardt.

4:9-12

With the resuming οὖν the Apostle again takes up the expression ὁ μακαρισμός, which he had used in v. 6, in order to add a new statement to it. He asks first of all: Ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυτίαν. No matter whether one supplies πίπτει or λέγεται or, what lies nearest, ἐστὶ, as a predicate, in any case the meaning is: Does this blessing come upon the circumcision or also upon the uncircumcision? Does the blessing, which David has expressed in the 32nd Psalm, come only upon one who is circumcised,

as David was circumcised, or at the same time also upon one who is uncircumcised? The following sentence: λέγομεν γάρ, ὅτι ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην , in its connection with the statement in v. 10, serves as an explanation of this question. Paul refers to an actual fact, on the basis of which alone this question kept general can be answered. "For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness." That the Apostle had previously stated, and he stays with this statement, in order to apply it from another viewpoint. He returns to Abraham, of whom he is treating particularly in this entire section, chapter 4. The τῷ Ἀβραάμ has the emphasis. "How then was it reckoned?" In what condition did Abraham find himself, when faith was accounted to him for righteousness, in the condition of circumcision, or in that of uncircumcision? The answer is: Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. He was not yet circumcised, when God counted his faith to him for righteousness. From that it is shown that that blessing of David extended not only upon those circumcised, like David and his like-minded contemporaries, but also upon the uncircumcised, like Abraham. Jews and Gentiles, have precisely through faith, a share in the forgiveness of sins or, what is the same thing, in the righteousness which avails before God. This thought is carried out still further in the following, no longer in retrospect upon David's statement in the 32nd Psalm, but with reference to the history of Abraham.

Paul continues in v. 11: "And he received the sign of circumcision" σημειον περιτομῆς , [meaning] the sign consisted of circumcision, "a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while uncircumcised." The Jews, as we have already remarked on this in 2:25, were boastful and defiant because of circumcision, by which they distinguished themselves from the Gentiles. They regarded it not only as a prerogative, but as a sort of merit. They taught that everyone who was circumcised had a share in the future kingdom. Thus they boasted also of their father Abraham, that he was circumcised. They thought that he had been beloved and worthy before God already for the sake of this outward sign and work, because he circumcised himself and all the males of the household. Over against that act the Apostle calls attention to the fact, first of all, that Abraham received, ἔλαβε , the circumcision, that it was not so much a work of Abraham as a gift of God. Secondly, that Abraham only later, after he had been justified by faith, was circumcised, that therefore neither now nor ever could circumcision be a means or basis of his justification. Thirdly, he calls circumcision a seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had in uncircumcision, σφραγιδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ . The last modifier

τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ does not belong to τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως, but only to τῆς πίστεως, as the parallel in 12b. The expression "the righteousness of faith" does not mean "righteousness which faith works, which has its foundation in faith" (Philippi), but the righteousness which Abraham received, applied to himself through faith. This righteousness of faith was sealed to him in circumcision. This outward sign in the flesh should make him certain of this and did make him certain that he was righteous before God, that he had God on his side. So little did circumcision for him stand in opposition or in contradiction to the justification by faith, the justification by grace, that the latter was rather confirmed by the former. And that was and remained also the significance of circumcision among the descendants of Abraham. Paul does not deny that circumcision was a nota externa (external mark), which distinguished the seed of Abraham from the nations of the Gentiles. Likewise he does not deny that circumcision in the flesh exhorts to circumcision of the heart, as he himself had called special attention to in 2:29. He here sets forth above all the worth of circumcision, that it was a seal, a confirmation of the righteousness of faith. That agrees with the ordinance and statement of God in Gn 17:11, according to which circumcision should be וְהָיָה לְאֵלֶיךָ, a sign of the covenant, of the covenant which rested on grace and on the promise of grace. Likewise in the Targum the discussion in regarding the seal of circumcision, which words also belong to the formula of circumcision: "Blessed be, who sanctifies the beloved from the womb and places the sign upon the flesh and seals his sons with the sign of the holy covenant" (Benedictus est, qui sanctificavit dilectum ab utero, et signum posuit in carne, et filios suos sigillavit signo foederis sancti.) Moreover, this applies also to the New Testament sacraments, especially also to Baptism, which corresponds to the Old Testament circumcision, that they are signs, seals and pledges of divine grace, of the righteousness which avails before God. In the Article 13 of the Augsburg Confession it reads: "Of the use of the Sacraments they teach that the Sacraments were ordained, not only to be marks of profession among men, but rather to be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us, instituted to awaken and confirm faith in those who use them." [De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sunt, non modo, ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidam in his, qui utuntur proposita.]

There follows an infinitive clause introduced with εἰς, whose content we must examine in order to be able to judge correctly regarding the connection with the foregoing. Verse 11b reads: εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι' ἀκροβυστίας "that he might be the father of all who believe without

being circumcised."

The sentence concludes: εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην, , "that righteousness should be reckoned to them." With most expositors we take this as a fuller explanation of the preceding. The second εἰς is thus parallel to the first εἰς and it relates to τὴν πιστευόντων . The purpose or the object of the faith is expressed therein. This awkward construction appears divided by the δι' ἀκροβυστίας standing in between.

The words of verse 12 are the continuation of the first infinitive clause: καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς , and that he was "a father of circumcision," that is, of the circumcised. Now the Apostle continues with the dative instead of the genitive: τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι τοῖς ἔχνεσι τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, "to those who not only are the circumcision, but who also follow in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham." One also says: εἰμὶ τινι πατὴρ , cp. Re 21,7: "and I will be his God and he will be my son," καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ θεὸς καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι υἱός . Luke 7,12: "the only son of his mother," υἱὸς μονογενῆς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ . Several of the ancient expositors and among the modern ones, especially, Hofmann, now find in the modifier of πατέρα , introduced with τοῖς , a double class of the children of Abraham described. This is seen first in the believing Jews, whom one understands under τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον , in that one supplements ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ πίστεως , and then the believing Gentiles, who are supposed to be those who walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham which he had already in uncircumcision, when he was still uncircumcised. It speaks against this, that the supplement is entirely arbitrary. In the first portion of this sentence one must think of the principal thought that these uncircumcised believe. First of all in v. 11b the believing Gentiles are thought of, then in v. 12a the believing Jews, then in v. 12b again the believing Gentiles, which would then make the apostolic decision run zigzag. No, it appears to the unprejudiced reader that which most of the exegetes have found here, that the Apostle in v. 11b presents Abraham as the father of the believing Gentiles. Then in the entire 12th verse he presents Abraham as father of the believing Jews, as father of the circumcised ones. This is inclusive of those circumcised ones to whom not only circumcision but also faith is peculiar, who also walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham. Indeed in this interpretation, at first glance the second τοῖς , before στοιχοῦσι , appears to be irregular, in that with the double τοῖς the same persons are meant. Philippi, Meyer, Weiss and others suppose that one must simply acknowledge this "error," and yet with that "consider

that negligences of expression are also found in the most eloquent and most correct authors." Ebrard asks: "Then should Paul not have the right to commit even once (as every man) a small grammatical error?" Certainly, Paul was also a man, but he has written the Letter to the Romans as one of the holy men of God, who were moved by the Holy Ghost. Still not only because we cling to the verbal inspiration, but also from this grammatical viewpoint we, with Fritzsche, Godet and others, dare to defend Paul against the apparently so small reproach of a small grammatical error. The repetition of the τοῖς in this case corresponds completely to the Greek idiom. It is sufficient here to refer to the New Testament idiom. Winer remarks in his Grammar, Para. 19: "But if such nouns, which are joined with a καί, have the same genus (kind), then the article does not stand - namely before the second noun - when the connected nouns are considered only as a part of a whole Mark 15,1: "with the elders and scribes," μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων . "On the other hand, the article stands in this case, where a genitive follows after the first noun, thus the second of a separate group is added, 1 Cor 1,28; 5,10." And Schierlitz writes in his Lexicon: "The article stands - namely before the second noun - when after the first noun a genitive follows, beyond which the principal article does not appear to be in effect, as in 1 Cor 1,28; 5,10." In the former passage we read: "the base things of the world and the despised," τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα , both concerning one and the same persons; in the latter: "And I did not at all mean with the immoral people of this world or with the covetous and swindlers, or with idolaters," καὶ οὐ πάντως τοὺς πόρνοις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἢ τοὺς πλεονέκταις ἢ ἄρπαξις ἢ εὐδωολάτραις. Here are names of persons, who belong to one group, the sinners of this world, included under the principal article, the first τοῖς . Since the first noun has a genitive with it, forms with this "a separate group," therefore with the second noun the article is repeated, which would otherwise be lacking, as it is lacking with the third and fourth nouns. Therefore this rule applies also, when instead of the nouns there are combined any other substantivized part of speech, and when these are joined to one another by means of οὐ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ instead of by καὶ or ἢ . And thus in our case the τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς Οὐσιν likewise forms a complicated expression, "a separate group," "beyond which the principal article is not in effect." Correctly Fritzsche quotes as a parallel also Php 1,29: "For to you it has been granted for Christ's sake, not only to believe in Him, but also to suffer for His sake," ὅτι ὑμῶν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν.

There the Apostle speaks of a uniform gift of grace, τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ , which,

however, carries in itself a twofold idea, τὸ εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύειν and τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν . There are named "two parts of a whole," which in themselves could be combined with one another without an article. Since the first number is not a simple but a compound expression, "a separate group," therefore the article is not in effect, but is repeated before the second member. In our passage the other consideration is also to be added, that the second designation of the circumcised ones is a participle, στολχοῦσι . Thus the other rule here finds its application: "The participle, which is independent and does not refer to a noun or pronoun, in most cases has the article." Blase, Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch, p. 153. Especially since to the participle στολχοῦσι such extensive modifiers are added, its own article appears so much more necessary. Moreover, it also corresponds to our German idiom and natural feeling for language, when in the translation of Ro 4:12, we translate this clause which is introduced with the relative τοῦς . We repeat the "welche" (who), which corresponds to the τοῦς , before the second, enlarged member of the relative clause, although in both members we describe the same persons.

Thus Abraham is the father of the believing Gentiles and of the believing Jews, the father of all believers, "our father," as Paul calls him, in that he includes himself with all believers. Evidently fatherhood in the spiritual sense is meant here. And the meaning is not that Abraham is the author of the faith of the believing Jews and Gentiles, as if the later believers owe their faith to Abraham, but the tertium comparationis (point of comparison), is "the same nature" (Luther), "the spiritual similarity" (Weiss). The children have the nature of the father. And wherein father Abraham and his children are like one another, what they have in common, is the same faith. Through faith every Gentile and Jew becomes a child of Abraham. All believing Gentiles and Jews walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham, and follow in the example of his faith. Thus it reads also in Ga 3,7: "Therefore, be sure that it is those who are of faith who are sons of Abraham." But self-evidently that is the justifying faith. Through faith, Gentiles and Jews, as Luther once expressed himself, come with Abraham "into the communion of the righteous." To them also, as to Abraham, righteousness is accounted. Luther writes: "Thus all those who believe after the example of Abraham are Abraham's seed and share in the blessing, be they Gentiles or Jews, circumcised or uncircumcised." St. Louis Edit., I, 1101. "There must be given to him, (Abraham) by God, children of such a nature as he himself, the father, had. He is, however, a father of faith, and that he began to be justified and pleasing to God did not come about because of the fact that he

could beget children, not that he had circumcision and the Law, but that he believed God. Whoever therefore would be a child of the believing Abraham must likewise believe, otherwise he is not a child of the elected, the one accepted to grace, to the justified Abraham" St. Louis Edit., IX, 314. That is thus the new thought which appears in this section. There is a large holy family upon earth, at whose head stands Abraham, the father of faith, which is the communion of all believers from among Jews and Gentiles, of all the sinners justified by faith. Also the fathers, the devout ones before Abraham, already belonged to this communion. The first believer was Adam. Nevertheless, since the Scriptures especially make prominent and extol the faith and justification of Abraham, therefore he appears as the father and ancestor of the family of believers. In a physical manner Abraham was the founder, also according to the circumcision he was the father of Israel, the Old Testament people of God. Still the real, true people of God, to which also the believing Israelites belong, is the totality of all believers, which is gathered from all the peoples of the earth. And that is now a comforting, elevating thought for every individual believer, that through faith, through which he is justified before God, he has also become a member of the true people of God, has entered into the great family of the children of Abraham, namely, the children of God on earth.

It is now also clear in what sense the infinitive clause, vv. 11b.12, introduced with εἰς, is joined to the foregoing. The εἰς here does not have the "ekbatic" but, as always, the "telic" meaning. In the foregoing five sentences, vv. 10.11a, the Apostle had named two facts from the history of Abraham, which pointed to the two facts of the future, which are mentioned in the purpose clause. With the fact that Abraham believed and was justified, when he still had not been circumcised, and with the fact that God later gave him the sign of circumcision as a seal of the justification by faith, which then also became the mark of his physical descendants, God had aimed fact that Abraham should be a father of the believing Gentiles. Abraham should also be a father of the believers from the circumcision, that He would raise from Abraham a spiritual seed from among the Gentiles and Jews. This miracle of grace, which the Apostle and the Christians of his time had before their eyes, which we also still have before our eyes, the Church of all believers, this great communion of pardoned, justified sinners, the assembly of the Church out of Israel and all the nations of the Gentiles, is already pictured in the history of Abraham, which had been fashioned by God. Strikingly Theodoret remarks: "For God knowing beforehand of the whole, as God will gather as one people out of Gentiles and Jews, and through faith it shall

offer to them salvation, as it stood written concerning Abraham the father of the nation," Ὁ γὰρ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς προειδὼς ὡς θεός, ὡς ἓνα λαὸν ἐξ ἐθνῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων ἀθροίσει, καὶ διὰ πίστεως αὐτοῖς τὴν σωτηρίαν παρέξει, ἐν τῷ πατριάρχῃ Ἀβραὰμ ἀμφοτέρω προδιέγραψε.

4:13-16.

After the Apostle has presented Abraham as the father of all believers from among the Jews and Gentiles, he joins Abraham and his family, in that he further testifies that the promise did not come to Abraham and his family by the Law, that he is an heir of the world, but by the righteousness of faith, v. 13. By the seed of Abraham there is to be understood here, according to the context, the spiritual descendants of Abraham, the Church of all believers. When it says: "the promise to Abraham or his descendants," ἡ ἐπαγγελίᾳ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, then it is to be noted that the Greeks and Latins in negative sentences place ἢ and aut, (or) where in positive sentences καὶ and et (and) are used. To Abraham and to his seed the promise has thus come, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου. This expression marks the development of the discussion. We do not have to think here of the promise, which is quoted in the following, that God had set Abraham as the father of many nations, Gn 17:5. For the many nations, which are given to Abraham, whose father Abraham is, are precisely that seed, the people of all believers, which has been gathered out of the nations of the earth. And this seed appears in our passage not as object, but like Abraham as recipient of the promise. With Calov, Fritzsche, Philippi, Meyer, Hofmann, and others we rather refer that which Paul here writes to the promises of God, as Gn 12,7; 13,14.15; 15,18; 17,8, in which Abraham is promised the possession of the land of Canaan. The earthly Canaan, however, was only a pledge of the better, perfect inheritance of the heavenly Canaan. Abraham looked for a city, which has a foundation, whose Builder and Creator is God, for the City of God above. He 11,10. The κόσμος, which is promised to Abraham, as well as to his seed also, is ἡ οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα, He 2,5, the new earth and the new heaven, of which Peter writes, 2 Pe 3, of which also Isaiah had already prophesied. The final σωτηρία consists in the possession and enjoyment of the future world. And now the Apostle calls attention to the fact that this promise did not come to Abraham and his seed through the Law, as if one could merit the future inheritance, salvation, by the fulfillment of the Law, but through the righteousness of faith. That is confirmed by the history of Abraham insofar as

to the believing Abraham, who was justified by faith and then received circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of faith, the promise of the possession of Canaan and with that the promise of the future world was confirmed. As already in the announcement of the theme of the Letter of the Romans, 1,16.17, Paul had presented the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, which is revealed in the Gospel, as the preliminary condition of the σωτηρία so now again, where he carries out his principal theme in extenso (extensively), he comes to speak of the final goal and the ultimate purpose of the righteousness which avails before God. Whoever is justified before God by faith shall then also inherit the world, which God has prepared for the children of men, the world of God, the glorified world, wherein dwelleth nothing but righteousness.

That men can never be saved by the Law, by the works of the Law, the Apostle establishes in v. 14 by the fact that, if those of the Law are heirs, οὐ ἐκ νόμου, that is, those who are disposed according to the Law, faith is emptied and the promise is destroyed, "faith is made void and the promise is nullified," κεκένωται ἡ πίστις καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία. The promise, which points to the future κληρονομία, is then abolished and with that faith has become empty, without content. That the promise falls in the established case again has its foundation in the fact that the Law works wrath, v. 15. This means it brings to man the wrath of God, the opposite of salvation. For "where there is no law, neither is their transgression," οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις. This sentence, which is this negative form, "without law no transgression," offers itself as a general statement, includes in itself the positive counterpart, that the Law always brings transgression with it. That no sinful man can fulfill the Law is here presumed as self-evident, as Paul has also testified expressly in 3,20, that by the works of the Law no flesh shall be justified before God. Thus with sinful man the Law always has the transgression of the Law as an effect. The transgression of the Law, however, arouses the wrath of Him who has given the Law. The thought connection, moreover, remains the very same, even if in v. 15 we follow the reading of the Codices D'ABC and instead of γὰρ read the metabatic δέ; οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, etc.

"Therefore thus it reads further in v. 16, because man cannot attain salvation through the Law, the inheritance is "by faith, that it might be in accordance with grace." Το ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν scil ἥ there is to be added κληρονομία γίνεταί. For this section deals with the inheritance not with righteousness. Faith and grace are correlates. With the one the other is established and given. Faith receives and grasps what God gives and promises

by grace. As man is justified by faith by grace, so shall he also be saved by faith by grace. And to this purpose, without any respect to man's work and conduct, God has given the promise of the inheritance, of salvation, by grace, so that it might be firm and certain, "in order that the promise may be certain," εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν . If it were in any way dependent upon the action and conduct of man, then it would be uncertain, because there is no reliance on the action of man. But now it rests alone on God and the gracious will of God. God has promised the inheritance to Abraham and his seed out of pure grace, free, gratuitously, and we can depend upon it in faith unconditionally. Thus the promises unfailing and certain, not only to the one who is of the Law, τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου , which means here who possesses the Law or is shaped by the Law, the believing Jew, but also to the one who is of the faith of Abraham, who like Abraham believes yet uncircumcised the believing Gentile.

The Apostle finally still remarks concerning Abraham: "who is the father of us all," and with that returns to that which he had said of Abraham in vv. 11.12: Abraham, the father of all believers from among Jews and Gentiles. That is the basic thought of this entire presentation. In vv. 9-12 Paul had proven from that all believers share the faith of Abraham and, like Abraham, are justified by faith. Then in the section, vv. 13-16, introduced with γάρ , he proves from the other circumstances that all believers, like Abraham, also receive the inheritance, salvation through faith,

Ro 4,17-22.

That Abraham is the father of us all, the father of all believers, v.16, stands in agreement with a word of Scripture, which has been fulfilled thereby. In v.17a the Apostle quotes Gn 17,5: "I have made you a father of many nations" ἡ πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε , To this Chrysostum remarks very strikingly: "not belonging to natural relationship, but according to the household of faith. ... for this type of faith makes all you sons of Abraham" οὐ κατὰ φυσικὴν συγγένειαν, ἀλλὰ κατ' οἰκείωσιν πίστεως...ὁ γὰρ τυπὸς τῆς ἐκείνου πίστεως πάντας ἡμᾶς υἱοὺς ποιεῖ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ . And not only according to the meaning of the Apostle, as is generally understood, but also according to the original text itself, the spiritual descendants of Abraham are to be understood under the many nations of the Gentiles. For outside of Israel only a few nations stemmed from Abraham in a physical manner. The first and foremost promise which Abraham received and which then carried through the later promise, that through Abraham all nations of the earth should be blessed. Gn 12,3, places such expressions as Gn 15,5: "So shall your seed be," and that of Gn 17,5, into the right light.

It reads further in v.17: κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ . The reading ἐπίστευσας , which is found only in several strongly interpolated codices and in few translators and fathers, discloses itself significantly enough as an incorrect one, through which the apparently abrupt transition from the second to the third person would be removed. Κατέναντι signifies similar to the classical κανεναντίον , coram, "before", "over against", "in view of". The Greek sentence contains an attraction, and this is to be resolved: κανέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε , and not ᾧ ἐπίστευσε , which would run contrary to the usual Greek manner of attraction. Thus one has to translate: "before him whom he believed, even God". This sentence, however, one cannot, as often happened, join to ὅς ἔστιν πατήρ πάντων ἡμῶν v. 16, and then treat the Old Testament quotation in v.17a as a parenthesis. For in the present time, since the days of Paul, Abraham is the father of us all, the father of all believers according to actual fact. In his lifetime, on the other hand, Abraham was at first only before God, in the eyes of God, the father of many believing children, the father of many nations. When he received that promise, he stood alone with his faith, since the son of promise had still not yet been born. The thought connection therefore demands the combination of the relative clause κατέναντι οὗ with the immediately preceding Old Testament quotation. Out of the τέθεικά σε, with Philippi, Godet and others, we take a supplementary thought "thus he was set", "and so he stood"-before God as the father of many nations. This construction, this change of person, Bengel already justifies with the remark: The construction τέθεικά σε, κατέναντι--θεοῦ , is similar to that: ἵνα εἰδῆτε, ἄρον Mt 9,6; Ro 15,3; Ac 1,4. This is an entirely natural continuation of the discussion, in that the Apostle would immediately add to this scriptural word, in which Abraham is addressed an explanatory statement, in which he could speak of Abraham only in the third person. And before God, who had appeared to Abraham and before whom he stood as the father of many nations, Abraham had also believed.

But the emphasis now lies on the further description of θεοῦ: τοῦ ζωοποιοῦντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα , " who gives life to the dead, and calls into being that which does not exist". The expression, "who gives life the dead," is taken by many expositors only as a general characterization of God the Almighty, according to 1 Sm 2,6; Dt 32,39. They at the same time discover an intimation of the restoring of Abraham's last generative power, which, will be mentioned only in the following and of which the hearers and readers of the Letter could not be aware in v.17. Evidently both attributes, which the Apostle ascribes to God, contain the guarantee for the fact that God could also fulfill His promise to Abraham, could and would really make Abraham

into that for which He at that time already regarded him, as the father of many nations. But then it appears as the most suitable thing, that with Origen, Anselm, Schrader, Olshausen, and Ewald we take it for granted that Paul considers even the transformation of the many nations into the children of Abraham, children of God, as an awakening from the dead, as he then also in Eph 2,4ff.; Col 2,13 describes the conversion of the Gentiles as a reawakening from the death of sin, as a resurrection. Also the second attribute, καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα, is explained differently by the expositors. The following three conceptions here come into consideration. Benecke, Weiss, Godet, Hofmann and Luthardt translate καλεῖν with "call", "name", "who names that which is non-existent as existing" they understand the sentence thus, that God had spoken to Abraham of a multitudinous posterity, had named them with names, as if they were already present at that time, and they see therein a proof of the omniscience of God. But not so much in the omniscience, but much rather in the omnipotence of God lay the security for the fulfillment of the promise. Meyer, Rueckert and Philippi take καλεῖν in the sense of "command". "Καλεῖν, like אָרַךְ, designates the arranging call of the commander, which he permits to go out over that which is ruled by him. Cp. Ps. 50,1; Is 40,26." Meyer. "But in this passage (v.17) God certainly commands nothing regarding the seed." Weiss. Already because of the parallel between καλοῦντος and ζωοποιοῦτος, the third meaning gains the preference, which is advocated and defended by Reiche, Koellner, Tholuck, DeWette, Bisping, Dilitzsch, by Luther and most of the ancient commentators, that καλεῖν is referred to the creating command of God, the creative activity of God. Cf. Is 41,4: "Who has performed and accomplished it, calling forth the generations from the beginning? - אֲנִי ה' אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אֶרְכֶּכֶּה. I the Lord, the first, and the last." Is 48,13: "Mine hand also has laid the foundation of the earth; and my right hand has spanned the heavens: when I call unto them אֶקְרָא אֲנִי אֶרְכֶּכֶּה they stand up together." God calls that which is not, τὰ μὴ ὄντα, not essentially different from τὰ οὐκ ὄντα, into being, ὡς ὄντα. This second ὄντα is the accusative of the effect or of the product. Cf. 1 Th 3,13: εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἀγλωσσίῃ. 1 Cor 1,8; 2 Cor 3,6; 1 Th 5,23. Winer, Para. 66, 3. The ὡς before ὄντα is not disturbing, but rather very fitting, in that it wards off that one reads ὄντα twice in succession and signifies not "like", but "as". God called that into being which was not, so that it stands as such, as being. Grimm: ὡς refertur ita alicujus personae s. rei s. actionis qualitate, ut sit i.q. talis qualis; ut is qui sim ... τὸν ὡς τὸν, τὸ ὡς τὸ post verba aestimandi, cognoscendi, declarandi, ut post" (refers to the quality of whatever a person, thing, or action, as in 'such as, such as!'; as he who is ... 'someone as someone,' 'something like something' after verbs of regarding, acknowledging, declaring,

as after (etc.)) λογίζεσθαι , λογίζεσθαι , Ro 8,36; 1 Cor 4,1; 2 Cor 10,2; ἡγεῖσθαι , 2 Th 3,15; ἔχειν , Mt 14,5; ἀποδεικνύειν , 1 Cor 4,9 παραβάλλειν, Mk 4,31; διαβάλλειν , Lk 16,1; ἐλέγχειν , Jas 2,9; εὐρίσκειν , Php 2,7."

The conversion of the Gentiles, to which this second attribute also points, Paul also takes otherwise, e.g., Eph 2,10, as a creative act of God. That is therefore the meaning of the Apostle: Abraham stands before God while he is still alone, and is declared by God as the father of many nations. And God, who makes the dead alive and calls into being that which is not, so that it is, shall certainly also in His time awaken to a new life the Gentile world, which is dead in sins, and call into existence the children of Abraham, who are not yet present, by His powerful, creating word. And to this the faith of Abraham was directed. Abraham believed in the presence of God. He conducted himself throughout toward God, so that he believed that which God said and promised to him. Already in Gn 15,6, after God had said to him: "So shall your seed be," he had the testimony that he believed the Lord. And so he also accepted in faith the other, similar promise which made him the father of many nations. The principal object of the faith of Abraham, as of the promise of God, was, as we have already remarked concerning 4,3, Christ and the salvation in Christ. With this promise, however, the other stood in close relation that through Abraham all the generations of the earth shall be blessed, that many children, likeminded with Abraham, from all nations shall become partakers of the salvation in Christ. And that Abraham also believed this latter, believed the God who quickens the dead and calls into being that which is not, is important for the characterization of the faith of Abraham, shows very significantly the nature of his faith. And thus already with the words κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε there begins the unfolding of the principal thought of this new section, which Calov strikingly states in the words: Certum est, tradere hic apostolum descriptionem illius verae et vivae fidei, per quam justificari nos hactenus docuit. (It is certain that the apostle here treats the description of that true and living faith, by which he has heretofore taught that we are justified). Weiss also emphasizes, "that already here (v.17) the discussion has its center of gravity in the portrayal of the Abrahamic faith."

In v.18 the faith of Abraham is more closely characterized with the words: ὅς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν . Abraham believed against hope, that is, where according to human reckoning and according to the course of nature nothing was to be expected, in that that promise of a numerous posterity contradicted the natural development of things. And [he believed] on hope, that is, not "on the foundation of hope," but "on toward hope," in that he stretched himself out with longing desire toward the promised blessing. The passages alluded to by Grimm prove that ἐπ' is used cum dativo (with the dative) is also used de concilio

et fine: (purpose and end) Ga 5,13; 1 Th 4,7; Eph 2,10; Php 4,10. The faith of Abraham is here placed under the viewpoint of hope, since the faith of the Old Testament devout stretched out to future things and blessings. The modifying clause εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν we do not take as the object of the faith of Abraham, since πιστεύειν εἰς is never otherwise construed with the infinitive. The object, to which Abraham's faith was directed, is self-understood in the context. But with Luther and other old commentators, with Rueckert, Tholuck, Philippi, Meyer, and Luthardt in the theological sense, as the εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι etc., v.11, we translate thus: "that he might become the father of many nations". Calov: εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι etc. significat finem fidei ratione directionis divinae, quia Deus fidem operatus est insignem in corde Abrahami, ut in spem etiam contra spem crederet, quo evaderet ipse ac constitueretur divinitus pater omnium credentium, ut hic omnibus gentibus exemplo praeiret, ut non male hic Grotius. (signifies the purpose of faith by reason of divine direction, because God effected a significant faith in the heart of Abraham, so that he might believe 'in hope even against hope,' according to which he himself might go forth and be divinely constituted the father of all believers, He here precedes all nations as example, as Grotius not ineptly says!) With that faith of Abraham, which was indeed His work, God had aimed at the fact that he should be the father of many nations. Many nations should walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham which is portrayed here and thereby become children of Abraham. And so it is a characteristic of all believers that they believe against hope in hope. The Christian faith goes directly contrary to nature and reason. The closing words of the 18 verse: κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον: Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου, "according to that which had been spoken, so shall your descendants be", we naturally refer to the immediately preceding. That Abraham should be a father of many nations (Gn 15,5: "So shall thy seed be," that is, as numerous and unnumbered as the stars of the heavens.

There follows in vv.19-21 a further statement regarding the faith of Abraham, which joins itself to the ὅς...πιστεύειν in v.18, but only loosely, so that it is not necessary for us to continue the relative construction in the German translation: καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἥδη νεκρωμένον ἑκατονταετίας που ὑπάρχων καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρα, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς, ὅτι ὁ ἐπάγγελται δυνατὸς ἔστι καὶ ποιῆσαι "And without becoming weak in faith he contemplated his own body, now as good as dead, since he was about a hundred years old, and the deadness of Sarah's womb; yet, with respect to the promise of God, he did not waver in unbelief, but grew strong in faith, giving glory to God, and being fully assured that what He had promised, He was able also to perform. Expolitio est jam dictorum, in qua fidem et fidei

Abrahami naturam et incrementum egregie depingit nobisque commendat, atque circumstantia personae et rei, quis et qualis ejus fides fuerit. (This is an elucidation of things already stated, in which the apostle depicts the faith, the nature and the growth of the faith of Abraham in an outstanding manner. (He shows) from the personal and material circumstances, what and of what nature Abraham's faith was.) Koerner. First of all we must become acquainted with the correct reading and construction of this sentence structure. It is unessential and of no importance for the sense of the apostolic statement, whether one reads or does not read the ἤδη before νεκρωμένον, as well as whether one reads or strikes out the καί before πληροφορηθείς. On the other hand, the οὐ before κατενόησε deserves special consideration. In DEFGKL we read this οὐ, while it is lacking in α' ABC. Following these latter witnesses, Weiss, Hofmann, Luthardt, Godet, Ebrard, and others take μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει κατενόησε as one concept, in the sense that Abraham had regarded his and his wife's impotence without weakness of faith, and take the following δέ as δὲ μεταβατικόν or in the intensifying sense. With most commentators we retain the οὐ, which perhaps, as Philippi and Meyer presume, was omitted from the text by a copyist, because it appeared to contradict that which is reported in Gn 17,17. For the contrary relationship, in which v.19 and v.20 apparently stand to one another, demands a negation before the verbum finitum (finite words) of the 19. verse. To the μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει "and without becoming weak in faith" in v.19 evidently ἐδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει "grew strong in faith" in v.20, the consideration of the impotence of the body in v.19, which was negated, is contrasted to the reference to the promise of God in v.20. But, in order to let the faith of Abraham appear so much greater and so much more amazing, the Apostle inserts another contrast to this contrast, in that he puts the words οὐ διερίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλά before the ἐδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει in v.20. Hereby it is to be considered that the first contrast is introduced with δέ, which in this connection means potius, "well, however", "on the contrary", "rather", while here there is brought into prominence the fact that instead of that which is negated in v.9 that which is mentioned in v.20 took place with Abraham. The second, on the other hand, is introduced with ἀλλά, sed, "but", in that faith, πίστις, forms the direct opposite to unbelief, ἀπιστία. Fritzsche had already construed it thus: Ac genuinum esse οὐ, vocabula δέ oppositionem inferens v.20 docet, quod ne librarios quidem praeterisset, si P. simplici appositione contentus scripsisset: (And that the οὐ, is genuine, the vocable δέ of v.20 teaches by inferring opposition, lest it might escape some copyists, if Paul had been pleased to write in simple negation): καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε...Σάρρας, ἐν- ἐδυναμώθη δὲ τῇ πίστει etc. Sed quo magis firma Abrahami fides exaggeraretur,

novam v.20 oppositionem illi (v.19) annectere maluit: (But that the firm faith of Abraham might be the more emphasized (exaggeretui), he prefers to attach a new opposite to it, v.19,20): εἰς δὲ τ.ε.τ.θ. οὐ διεκρίθη τ.α., ἀλλ' ἐδύναμώθη τ.π. We translate accordingly: "and without becoming weak in faith, he contemplated his own body, now as good as dead since he was about an hundred years old, and the deadness of Sarah's womb; yet with respect to the promise of God he did not waver unbelief; but grew strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully assured that, what He had promised, He was able also to perform"

After this necessary, formal analysis we examine more closely the individual statements of the preceding passage. The Apostle thus describes the faith of Abraham first negatively, denies that he became weak in faith, that he considered his and his wife's physical deadness. He refers here to that which is reported in Gn 17. When Abraham was almost 100 years old, when he was 99 and his wife Sarah was 90 years old, when he had already lost the power of procreation and Sarah had lost the power of conception, God gave him this promise: "you shall be a father of many nations" (Gn 17,4). And He promised him further that He would give him a son by Sarah Gn 17,16. Both promises stood in close relation to each other. Through Sarah's son Isaac, Abraham should gain, first of all, a numerous physical posterity, and so also the one Seed, Christ, and through Him the numerous spiritual seed. That Abraham and Sarah in their old age should still become father and mother certainly appears unbelievable. It went against all human expectation and directly against the course of nature. It would not have been astonishing, if Abraham had become weak in faith, if Abraham had doubted the promise of God. But, no, he did not become weak in faith and proved that by the fact that he did not consider his and Sarah's impotent bodies: "Being not weak in faith, he considered not," etc., μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε etc. v.19. The dative τῇ πίστει is the dative of relation. Κατανοεῖν those commentators who strike the οὐ out of the text take in the sense of "consider", "perceive", in that they lay the stress on the preceding modifier and explain that words, that Abraham, without becoming weak in faith, considered his and Sarah's impotent body. But κατανοεῖν also signifies "to fasten the attention on something," oculos mentemque in re defigere (Fritzsche), "to take heed to" something. In Lk 12,24; He 3,1; 10,24 Luther has pertinently translated the expression with "observe, consider, perceive": "consider the ravens", "consider the Apostle and High Priest", "let us consider one another". And that is the sense of the word in our passage also. And now the Apostle emphasizes that Abraham did not consider his and his wife's condition of body. He paid no attention to that. He did not dwell upon that with his thoughts reckoned not with that which lay before his eyes, what he felt and experienced, his physical nature. He put

nature, reason, feeling, and experience entirely out of his mind, and showed precisely thereby that he did not become weak in faith.

But how? Does the judgment of Paul concerning Abraham agree with that which we read in Gn 17,17? It reads there: "Then Abraham fell upon his face and laughed, and said in his heart, Will a child be born to a man one hundred years old? and will Sarah, who is ninety years old, bear a child?" Was that not a question of doubt? Most commentators think so and then remark that Abraham had not given much room to the doubting, but had soon overcome the weakness of faith. It is so certain that in the life of all believers there are still many weaknesses of faith and that Abraham also occasionally became weak in faith, for example, when he took Hagar as his wife at the demand of Sarah. Still it would be strange, if the Apostle even in such a case, where the Old Testament records a weakness of faith in Abraham, had praised Abraham, that he did not become weak in faith. We therefore hold that Luther was correct, when he gave this exegesis on Gn 17:17:

"These are the words of one who in no wise doubts but is astonished and transported with joy, just as the laughter is also evidence of a heart overflowing with joy ... Now Abraham puts Ismael out of sight and out of mind. Up to this time he had loved him most tenderly as the hope of the blessing. Now he forgets about his own dead body, even about corpse-like Sarah, and sees with certainty that an heir is to be born to him from Sarah. Therefore he laughs and rejoices, and later on, as a result of this very laughter and this spiritual and inexpressible joy, a name is given to the son, and he is called Issac for an everlasting remembrance and an eternal monument of a faith so glorious, steadfast, and sure that when these words had hardly been uttered by the Lord, the saintly man is filled with such great joy." [LW, Vol 3, p.154].

Now in v.20 the positive side is emphasized. Instead of becoming weak in faith Abraham rather became strong in faith, namely εἰς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, quod attinet ad promissionem Dei, or even more exactly and pointedly: "in view of the promise of God". He turned his eyes away from his own impotent body and from the barrenness of the womb of Sarah and, to the contrary, turned his look of faith, directed and unmoved, to the promise of God. It was God's promise. God had promised him these unbelievable events and in that he submerged himself in God's word and promise. God's power became mighty in him, and thus he was strong in faith. This thought is even strengthened by the inserted antithesis: οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ. The διακρίνεσθαι presents the doubting as a vacillations, as an inner thought conflict. We do not take the dative τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ as instrumental, but like the double τῇ πίστει as dativus relationis (dative of relation). Unbelief in the more general concept, and that expresses itself in the fact that one calls into question that which God has said and promised. But that was not the case with Abraham; he did not doubt in unbelief. What he saw, felt, and experienced before his eyes was indeed suited for awakening

doubting thoughts in him, but he did not give room to such thoughts. Thus God's word and promise always gained more room in his heart, and thus he grew strong in faith. That the statement offered here in v.20 is kept so general especially what has been said concerning the growing strong, concerning the growth of the faith of Abraham, points to the fact that the Apostle no longer has in mind exclusively that one act of faith reported in Gn 17, but would mark generally the habitus of Abraham, the father of faith.

Yes, Abraham is the father of us all. And so the faith of all believers of all times has the same nature and quality as the faith of Abraham. According to God's determination Abraham is the prototype of faith. We can and should learn more closely from his example, what the nature of justifying, saving faith truly is which, as Luther says, is faith's proper work. The true faith, and we can now also say, the Christian faith, looks away from that which lies before the eyes, from one's own person, from one's own weakness and infirmity. This means applied to ourselves faith looks away from our own sinfulness and depravity, and looks alone to the promise of God, which has essentially the same content for us as for Abraham, which is Christ and the salvation in Christ. Faith does not reckon with that which one observes round and about oneself and in oneself, what one feels and experiences in one's own heart. Faith and promise are, as our confessions often bring to our attention, correlata. In the Apology once says:

"For only faith in the heart looks to the promise of God." Luther writes: Atque haec est ratio, cur nostra theologia sit certa, quia rapit nos e conspectu nostro et ponit nos extra nos, ut non nitamur viribus, conscientia, seu persona, seu operibus nostris, sed eo nitamur, quod est extra nos, hoc es promissione et veritate Dei, quae fallere non potest. (And this is the reason why our thoelogy is certain: it snatches us away from ourselves and places us outside ourselves, so that we do not depend on our own strength, conscience, experience, person, or works but depend on that which is outside ourselves, that is, on the promise and the truth of God, which cannot deceive). Cf.Ad. Galatas, Erl. Ausg.II, 161-181.

How does it then stand with us Christians, how does our life of faith manifest itself? When we look to ourselves, when we look into our heart and life, there we still find very much sin, perversity and unrighteousness. Often we feel in our hearts and conscience the terrors of death and of condemnation. Then it would appear to us unbelievable and impossible that God should still be gracious and save us. "Many find it far harder to believe that God can love them, notwithstanding their sinfulness, than the hundred-years-old patriarch did to believe that he should be the father of many nations" Hodge. But we do not permit ourselves to be misled by that, overcome the doubt which arises out of the natural heart, listen not to the voice from above, to the promise of God, which promises us in Christ salvation, grace, forgiveness of sins, righteousness, life and blessedness. We know what

God's Word says to us is the truth, is more firm and certain than what our own heart tells us. And the longer and more persevering we sink and plunge heart, mind and thoughts into God's Word, just so much more shall we become strong in faith and become full of the Word and the grace of God. That is the habitus of the believer. Self-evidently passing weaknesses of faith are not excluded thereby. But if at some time we are inclined to become weak in faith and have become weak, then one look to God's promise lifts us up again, frees us from ourselves, and transfers us again into our own element, and that is God's Word and promise.

The participial clause in v.10b and v.21: δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ , etc., "giving glory to God" etc., brings nothing new into that which was said previously, brings no new elements of faith, but mentions what happened with the previously portrayed faith of Abraham eo ipso (in itself). Exactly by this that Abraham looked directly to the promise of God, he gave glory to God. And that is generally true. Real faith gives the glory to God. Man gives God the glory when he recognizes, acknowledges, praises, and also in action confesses God as that which He is. Man as a creature of God gives God the glory, in that he recognizes and confesses Him as the almighty and gracious Creator, and thanks Him for His benefits. Then he also acknowledges Him as the Lord and Master of his life, fulfills the δικάωμα τοῦ θεοῦ , which already in creation had been written in his heart. Man gives God the glory, when he walks in the bounds which the Creator has drawn around His creation and deals and walks according to God's will and commandment. This due honor men have withheld from God, as the Apostle proved in the first chapter of our Letter. And in this sense also in our passage men have variously taken and considered the δαδόναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ , to speak with Hofmann, that Abraham with his faith had fulfilled the most essential obligation of the creature over against the Creator. Then the faith of Abraham and faith in general appears essentially as obedience over against God and God's commandment, as a fulfilling of the Law. But with this meaning the nerve of faith is severed. Here in Ro 4 we certainly do not find ourselves in the sphere of the creation and of the Law, but in the province of redemption and of the Gospel. What "giving glory to God" means here in Ro 4:20 one sees from the context. That Abraham's faith was directed simply and only to the promise of God, precisely thereby, as we have already remarked above, he gave glory to God. This relationship of faith to the promise is still further set into the light by the following words, πληροφορηθείς, ὅτι ὁ ἐπηγγέλται δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι "and being fully assured that what He had promised, He was able also to perform," which thus serves for the explanation of the first part of the participial clause, just the same whether one reads καὶ before πληροφορηθείς or not. Abraham was convinced more precisely: firmly and fully

convinced of the fact that God could also do what He had promised him, that He could and would make him the father of many nations, that He could and would through his Seed prepare the salvation for all the nations of the earth. He had unconditional trust in the power and grace of God, through which the fulfillment of the promise was guaranteed. And that is faith in general: πληροφορία, firm conviction, certainty, a certainty worked by God Himself. Whoever believes trust God, that in spite of his own unworthiness and impotence He shall surely give him that which He has promised in Christ, namely, righteousness, life and salvation. "Therefore the faith which makes one devout and righteous before God is not alone this, that I know the historical facts, how Christ was born, suffered, etc. (the devils also know that). But is the certainty or the certain, strong trust in the heart, since I hold with my whole heart the promise of God as certain and true, through which there is offered to me without any merit on my part the forgiveness of sins, grace, and all the salvation through the one Mediator, Christ." Apology, Mueller, Symb. B., p.95. Calov remarks on Ro 4:21:

Non persuasionem tantum, sed firmam fiduciam τὸ πληροφορεῖσθαι infert, cum quis quasi plenis velis fiducia sua fertur, ad eam rem, qua confidit, metaphora a navibus desumpta, nec cum Vulgata reddente plenissime sciens et Papistis referendum ad intellectum, sed ad voluntatem potius ac cor. ... Rectissime dicitur nomen fidei in evangeliiis, cum ei tribuitur salus aut consecutio omnium, quae volumus, complecti utrumque, nempe et assensum illum firmum in credendis de Deo et Christo, et fiduciam ex illius omnipotente bonitate conceptam. (τὸ πληροφορεῖσθαι introduces not only persuasion, but firm trust, when someone is borne as by full sails in his trust in the matter, in which he trusts, a metaphor taken from ships, not to be rendered with the Vulgate as 'abounding in knowledge' or referred with the papists to the intellect, but rather to the will and heart... It is properly called 'faith' in the Gospels, since to it is ascribed salvation and all its effects which we desire. It embraces both, certainly that firm assent to the things to be believed regarding God and Christ, and the trust conceived through his omnipotence and goodness.)

He also quotes what Flacius once said concerning Luther:

Saepe cum piae memoriae D. Martinum Lutherum plena in Deum fiducia, laetaque et erecta fronte in templum vadentem intuitus sum, ejusque actiones plane ipso Elia dignas perpendi, visus mihi sum illam longe maximam navim (quam illi Galeonem vocant) omnibus velis vento inflatis contra hostes pergentem cernere. (He (Calov) also cites what Flacius says concerning Luther: 'often when I saw D. Martin Luther of pious memory walking into the church in the full trust in God, with joyful and erect forehead, his movements seemed worthy of those of Elijah himself. I seemed to discern that very longest ship (which they call galley) pressing against the enemy with full sails.'

And just with such confident, victoriously confident faith man gives glory to God. He recognizes Him thereby as the One who has revealed Himself in Christ, in the Gospel, as the omnipotent, gracious Redeemer and Savior of mankind. Whoever firmly trust God and His promise honors God, not in that with his actions and works he

promotes the glory of God, but in that he gives up all claims to all his own work, goes out of himself, permits God alone to rule, do, work, and only simply takes that which God promises, gives and presents to him. "And should anyone truly be greatly amazed, why the opponents still teach very little or nothing regarding faith, still they look very closely into all the syllables of the Bible, that faith is lauded and praised as the highest, noblest, holiest, greatest, most pleasing worship of God. ... Thus He (God) would be honored, that we should take and receive from Him grace, salvation, and every blessing, and namely out of grace, not for the sake of our own merit" Apology, Mueller, p.97. Yes, such worship of God, when man only takes and receives from God grace, salvation, and every blessing, is much better, greater, higher, nobler, holier, and more God-pleasing than when he honors and praises God with his work and conduct.

With the remark: "therefore also it was reckoned to him as righteousness" namely, the faith, τὸ πιστεύειν, v.22, which refers to 4:3, the Apostle closes the description of the faith of Abraham, which is contained in this section. Hofmann remarks to this: "In no way had Abraham's very own action made him the one who had God for himself and became the father of the people of God. But his faith had done that, with which he, however, gave the glory to God, which man owes to Him, so that from this it explains itself, how it could be imputed to him for righteousness. ... He is the ancestor of all believers by his faith, which constituted the essential fulfillment of duty over against God." Thus according to Hofmann's opinion, which is also shared by other modern theologians, faith justifies because it gives to God the glory which man owes to God as a creature, because it is the essential fulfillment of duty over against God. If that were the meaning of the Apostle, then he would thereby again take back everything that he had previously taught regarding justification by grace, without the works of the Law. He would tear down again with one stroke what he had previously built up. No, not for that reason, because faith is a fulfillment of an obligation, not because of its perfection or strength, but only for this reason is faith counted to man for righteousness. This is because faith as Paul had testified previously, holds itself simply to the promise of God and takes grace, salvation and righteousness out of the promise. In the detailed description of faith from v.17 on Paul only amplified and very significantly placed before our eyes that faith as the medium ληπτικόν, and first that which faith takes, takes from God out of the Word, is that which justifies man before God. Even that which is said of the strengthening of faith in v.20 is to be understood in this sense, namely, that the believer with ever greater joy and confidence comforts himself in the promise of God and with that the righteousness, which is promised and imparted to him in the promise.

A fine summary of the doctrine of faith, which is contained in this section, vv.17-22, is given by Koerner in the following words:

Disce hic" Primum, fidem non esse tantum notitiam historiae, vel otiosam cogitationem, aut opinionem incertam, sed esse πληροφορίαν, firmam persuasionem et plenum assensum, promissionem Dei intuentem, apprehendentem et retinentem. Secundo, merito damnari eorum doctrinam, qui jubent etiam credentes de gratia Dei dubitare, et docent, eos certo scire non posse, num remissionem peccatorum sint consecuti. Tertio, fidem non respicere ad externa objecta et impedimenta, neque ea curare, nec quaerere, num sint impossibilia, annon, sed tantum niti verbo promissionis, et ab eo totam pendere. Quarto, fidem initio infirmam et languidam sensim crescere, vires acquirere et confirmari. Quinto, fidem tribrere gloriam Deo, testimonium veritatis, misericordiae et omnipotentiae, et esse praecipuum cultum, quem Deus requirat, et qui solus ipsi probetur, sitque impiis et atheis plane ignotus. Postremo, disce fidei praecipuum effectum esse, quod ea impetremus et assequamur promissa, et, quod maximum est, ea obtineatur promissa iustitia, remission peccatorum et donatio vitae aeternae. (Learn here: First, that faith is not mere knowledge of the history, neither idle meditation nor uncertain opinion, but πληροφορίαν, the firm persuasion and full agreement, looking to, apprehending, and retaining the promise of God. Secondly, that the doctrine of those is deservedly condemned, who even order that the believers should be in doubt about the grace of God, and teach that they cannot with certainty know, whether they may attain the forgiveness of sins. Thirdly that faith does not regard external objects and hindrances, neither has anxious concern for them, nor asks whether they are impossible, surely not that, but solely relies upon the word of the promise and depends upon it totally. Fourthly, that a faith weak and sluggish in the beginning gradually grows, acquiring strength and confirmation in it. Fifthly, that faith renders glory to God as a testimony to His truth and mercy and omnipotence, and that this is the chief art of worship, which God requires, also the only worship approved by him, though this be altogether unknown to the impious and godless. Finally, learn the chief effect of faith, namely that by it we seek and pursue the promises, and greatest of all; by it the promised righteousness, the forgiveness of sin, and the gift of eternal life are obtained.

4:23-25.

These last verses complete the discussion regarding Abraham, which has carried through the entire chapter. What is written concerning Abraham, namely, in the passages of Genesis quoted and expounded in this chapter, is not only written for the sake of Abraham, that the future generations might be informed concerning him. Not only that faith was counted to him for righteousness ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, scil. τὸ πιστεῦν εἰς δικαιοσύνην, but also for our sakes, so that we might learn from Abraham's example how we are justified before God. This thought lies at the base of the entire preceding treatment, but is here once again brought into prominence. Also to us shall faith be counted for righteousness, μέλλει λογίζεσθαι. This is God's ordinance and decision. The present μέλλει designates the λογίζεσθαι as a fact which continues throughout the entire New Testament times. And now the Apostle establishes exactly the object of the specific, Christian New Testament faith. We Christians believe in God who raised our Lord Jesus from the dead, in the Father of Jesus

Christ, and with that also in Jesus Christ Himself. Paul mentions especially the resurrection of Christ from the dead, in order to permit the Christian faith to appear similar to the faith of Abraham. Abraham already believed in God who quickens the dead, v.17, and we Christians believe in God who has already proved this power of His, who has made alive again Jesus, who was crucified. Bengel: ¶Fides Abrahami ferebatur in id, quod futurum esset et fieri posset, nostra in id, quod factum est, utraque in Vivificatorem.] (The faith of Abraham deals with that which is future and can be done, both believe in Him who gives life). That corresponds in general to the difference between the Old and the New Testament. The Old Testament devout believed in the future Christ; the New Testament devout believe in the Christ, who has come and appeared in the flesh. The resurrection of Christ, however, is not for itself the content and object of the Christian faith, but in its connection with the death of Christ and of the effects of both inclusively. Thus it reads further, v.25: ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν . ("He who was delivered up because of our transgressions, and was raised because of our justification.) Christ has first of all been given into death, namely for the sake of our transgressions, in order to expiate and atone for them. And then He has been raised again, and namely for the sake of our justification. Most modern commentators understand this last statement thus, that through the resurrection of Christ the later working of faith and with that the justification, which is dependent upon faith, has been made possible. This interpretation, however, contradicts the presentation of the Apostle in 1:17; 3:21ff., according to which the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is once and for all already presented in Christ and is offered to man as a prepared gift in the Gospel. And in our passage the διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν is evidently parallel to the διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν . As through the death of Christ the atonement of our sins is worked directly, so our justification through the resurrection of Christ. As in and with the death of Christ the atonement of our sins is established and given, so in and with the resurrection of Christ is our justification established and given. The purpose, in that it reads διὰ, διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν , is here, as more often, thought of as the cause. Therefore God has raised Christ from the dead, because thereby He desired to justify us, and this purpose was fulfilled with the resurrection. Our justification thus appears in our passage as an effect of the resurrection of Christ. Certainly the righteousness which avails before God is already presented and prepared through the death, through the bloody atonement of Christ, as we have proven in detail above. If the sin of man is really atoned for, made good before the eyes of God, annulled, then men thereby are eo ipso (in itself) justified before God. But both, the atonement like the justification, which materially coincide, are then strengthened

and sealed through the resurrection of Christ. In that God raised Jesus from the dead, He has actually declared that the death of Christ has fulfilled its purpose, that sin has been expiated, that He has accepted the expiation. So the glorious resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, this glorious victory over death and sin, is also at the same time an actual, solemn and formal absolution, which God has spoken over sinful mankind. Like the atonement for sin, so is this judgment of justification general, applies to the entire world of sinners. The Apostle, however, in that he writes ἡμᾶς, ἡμῶν, refers both especially to the believing Christians. For the believers think first of all on that, take comfort in that which God has done especially for them in Christ. That Jesus moreover is called "our Lord" in this connection is here as little as anywhere else an empty epitheton ornans (ornamentals statements). Through His death and resurrection and their effect Christ is even our Lord and we have become His own. Likewise from the description presented here of the Christian faith and its object it becomes sufficiently evident why faith is counted to us for righteousness. Especially for this reason, because faith applies to itself Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen One, and with that His atonement and justification. The δολαίωσις has happened and is declared. That we believe, in that we comfort ourselves. Whoever therefore believes draws this δολαίωσις to his own person. And so everyone who believes shall be regarded by God as justified.

Summary of the 4 chapter: Abraham, the father of all believers, in so far as all believers, like Abraham, are justified alone by grace through faith and also receive the inheritance, in so far as in all believers dwells the faith of Abraham, who entirely disregards his own person and adheres solely to the promise of God.

CHAPTER 5

5:1-11. The Blessed Results of Justification.

5:1-5a.

With Δικαιωθέντος οὖν ἐκ πίστεως , "Therefore having been justified by faith," the Apostle resumes the closing thought of chapter 4, διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν , "because of our justification," and in general refers to the entire preceding discussion. Now he speaks of that which takes place in us after we have been justified by faith, and describes the blessed effects of justification. The first result is that we now have peace with God. The expression εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν , "we have peace with God," does not mean tranquillitas animi nor pax conscientiae, but rather the peaceful relationship we have with God, which indeed is reflected in peace of conscience. Philippi remarks fittingly, "The discussion here is not yet, as in 8:2ff., about removing our ἔχθρα , "enmity," against God, but about removing the ἔχθρα , "enmity," (cf. v. 10) or the ὀργή "wrath," of God against us. Not the sanctifying, but the benedictive effects of justification are portrayed in vv. 1-11. In this entire chapter the Apostle does not yet depart from the wonderful and comforting objectivity of the doctrines of atonement and justification. He first leads us, through a development of their blessed results, still deeper into the knowledge of their essence." And we must admit that Philippi is right, when he continues, "For this reason, the reading, which is supported by important but not predominating witnesses, is accepted by Lachmann, but rejected by most commentators. This apparently arises from the ecclesiastical, parenthetical use of our passage εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν , "let us (through the withdrawing from sin, or by a God-pleasing life, or by remaining faithfully devoted to Christ) maintain peace with God," is to be designated as unsuitable and untenable. If our peace with God consists of the suspension of divine wrath, then we cannot maintain peace, but God must do so. Only the maintaining of faith, not the maintaining of peace, is within man's power. However, the Apostle cannot admonish us to maintain peace

with God, because he has not yet spoken of the fact that we have peace. That we have peace is especially expressed by the indicative ἔχομεν ." Similarly, Meyer writes, ἔχωμεν , is read in A,C,D,K,L,S, in minuscules and several translations (Syria, Vulgate, and Itala), and certain fathers. But this reading, although strongly attested, is, according to the sense, "let us maintain peace with God," completely unsuitable here. Since a new theoretic subject begins, it would be strange to begin with an admonition concerning a subject of which nothing had yet been said. Therefore the equally strongly attested ἔχομεν is to be retained, and the subjunctive is deduced from a misunderstanding or from the parenthetical use of the passage." And Weiss, "Likewise the whole train of thought of the Letter is perverted if one here allows the Apostle to pass over to the section of admonition. All of the following shows that the dogmatic exposition continues undisturbed and deals with the effects of justification, including this first and foremost result. Therefore, it cannot be made independently the subject of admonition. ... In general, the relationship of peace to God can only be brought about from God's side, in that He declares man as well-pleasing to Him. Therefore, man cannot be admonished to keep peace with God. So it remains, that the reading is utterly inept (prorsus ineptum). In this case, even Tischendorf, in spite of the outward testimony, suggests that it must be abandoned, although he will not concede that this is so." The inner reasons here presented in favor of the indicative ἔχομεν are so evident and decisive that it is not worth the trouble to examine more closely the recent attempts of Hofmann, Ebrard, and Klostermann to justify the subjunctive on the basis of the facts.

Through our Lord Jesus Christ peace with God has been mediated to us, precisely through Him, "through whom also we have obtained our introduction by faith into this grace in which we stand," δεῦ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχίκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ^{ἐστήκαμεν} (v. 2a). Here προσαγωγή' is, as in Eph 2:18,3,12, to be taken in the intransitive sense and signifies "admission" or "access." The grace to which Paul points is the grace of justification. Through Christ, through His atoning death, this grace has been obtained for us and access opened to it. Through faith in Christ, in that we have become believers, we have entered into this grace and now stand in grace. The condition of the Christian is a condition of grace. If we are justified from sins, if our sins are forgiven, then God has nothing more against us and nothing lies between God and us any longer.

A second effect of justification is that we now boast of the hope of the glory of God (v. 2b). The words καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ,

"and we exult in hope of the glory of God," are not a continuation of the relative clause in v. 2a, but of the principal clause in v. 1b. With ἐπί, as with other verbs of emotion, the foundation and object of καυχάσθαι is introduced. Hope appears here as a benefit in which the Christian rejoices and boasts. That which he hopes for is the glory of God; that is, the glory which is God's own and which shall also be imparted to him (Cp. Ro 8:17). Already in 1:16 the Apostle had pointed to the final goal of the righteousness of faith, "salvation," σωτηρία. And in 4:13 he had spoken of the future inheritance, which we receive in the same manner as righteousness; that is, by grace through faith. Now, as he exhibits the sanctifying effects of justification by faith, he lingers with the vision of the glorious future which has been opened to believing, justified Christians.

We Christians boast of the hope of future glory, but not only that, "but we also exult in tribulations" (v. 3a). Thus we translate ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, and not, "but we also exult in our tribulations." For we do not have two different situations in which a Christian boasts of the hope, but two objects of praise set over against one another. Καυχάσθαι ἐν τινι, "to boast in a thing," is a common construction in the New Testament (Cp. Ro 2:17; 5:11; 2 Cor 10:15; Ga 6:13). The way in which we can boast of tribulation, which appears to be contradictory to the future glory, is stated by the following, "knowing that tribulation brings about perseverance; and perseverance, proven character; proven character, hope" (vv. 3b-4). Tribulation results only in benefiting us. For in the manifold oppressions of this time, faith is exercised and proven and becomes patience, endurance, and steadfastness (ὕπομονή); and because faith overcomes all adversity, it is established (δοκιμή). In this way also, hope is strengthened and increased. In the darkness of suffering, the hoped-for glory becomes clearer and brighter to the experienced Christian. And the hope of the Christian does not permit him to be disappointed; really, does not disappoint one, οὐ κατασχύνει (v. 5a). Hope would disappoint us if it deceived us by remaining unfilled. But that it does not do. The present κατασχύνει expresses this thought more strongly than the future κατασχυνεῖ, to which Hofmann incorrectly gives preference.

5:5b-11.

Why our hope does not disappoint and why it shall certainly be fulfilled, the Apostle answers with the words, "because the love of God has been poured out

within our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given to us," $\delta\tau\iota\ \eta\ \alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\$ (v. 5b). With "the love of God," $\eta\ \alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\$, through which ^{δοθέντος ἡμῶν} the fulfillment of the Christian hope is guaranteed, our love toward God certainly is not meant, as Hofmann would have it. For concerning the love which we have toward God and which first has risen in our hearts, it surely cannot be said that it is "poured out within our hearts." What is poured out in our hearts must originally have its existence outside of us. And with the expression "But God demonstrates His own love toward us," $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\iota\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\eta\acute{\nu}\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (v. 8), the concept of "the love of God," $\eta\ \alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\$ (v. 5), is evidently taken up again. Therefore, with most commentators we take $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\$ as a subjective genitive and $\eta\ \alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\$ as a designation of the love which God has for us. But this is not in the sense that God had proven His love to us or had given us His Spirit and awakened us to a new, spiritual life. According to this interpretation, as taken by Hofmann, "out of the change already accomplished in us" the Apostle would conclude the other change, which we still hope for, "the glorification of the body," and from "the holiness of the life which is placed into us," he would conclude "the glory corresponding to this holiness." Such an argument, however, lies entirely outside of the context. According to 5:1, the Apostle describes in this context the effects of justification and also presents precisely our hope and its certainty as a result of justification, not as an effect of sanctification.

And in the following, v. 6ff., he now calls special attention to the objective proof of the love of God: that Christ has died for us. Concerning the love which God entertains toward us and which has proven itself in the death of Christ, it is thus stated in v. 5b that it is shed abroad in our hearts. It reads "has been poured out within our hearts" $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$. The Greek, as well as the Latin, can consider wine poured out in a vessel, as well as poured out from a vessel (Cp. LXX, Ps 45:2: "Grace is poured upon your lips," $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\chi\acute{\upsilon}\theta\eta\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$). What this means to say is that the love of God, this affection, this attitude of God toward us was shed into our hearts. Calov strikingly explains it with the words, "This love is poured into us, not as a tangible matter, but as a revelation and as an effect or feeling thereof it is poured into our hearts." [*quae caritas effusa in nobis non qua inhaesionem subjectivam, sed qua manifestationem et qua effectum vel sensium ejusdem in cordibus nostris effusam.*] And just this has taken place through the Holy Ghost, who has been given to us. The Holy Spirit has been poured out upon

And just this has taken place through the Holy Ghost, who has been given to us. The Holy Spirit has been poured out upon us richly (Tt 3:6, Ac 10:45). He very richly and powerfully witnesses to us that God loves us, has loved us in Christ, and gives us to experience the love of God inwardly, in our hearts. And because it is the Spirit of God who has given us to experience God's love, we are therefore entirely certain of the same - divinely certain. "Thus we see," Philippi concludes his explanation of v. 5, "that the Apostle, even if he allows the hope of eternal life to be strengthened by constancy and confirmation in suffering, he nevertheless considers this constancy and confirmation as insufficient ground for this hope. Rather, he designates not our love to God, which confirms itself through constancy, but God's love to us, which rests in Christ's atoning death, as the sufficient and secure foundation of our hope for future glory."

In the sentence structure of v.6 forward (on which we have already reflected in part in order to establish the meaning of ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 5), how far the love of God is a guarantee of our hope is explained more thoroughly. First of all, we must consider here how immediately following words are to be read. According to the lectio recepta the text of v. 6 reads, "For while we were still helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly," Ἐπεὶ γὰρ Χρῖστος ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν ἔτι κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε. The ἔτι after ἀσθενῶν is found in A,B,C,D,E,F,G, is so strongly attested that we must by all means retain it. Also, the ἔτι at the beginning of the sentence has important witnesses for it (A,C,D,E,K,P, Mnn., Mrc., Iren., Or., and Syr.) but it appears as inconvenient. The second ἔτι is easily understandable, "while we were still helpless." On the other hand, the first ἔτι is hard to understand. When one applies to it that which lies closest to the principal clause, then one must exert every art and ingenuity to gain a tolerable meaning for the sentence, "Christ died for the ungodly." Therefore, several commentators, who contend for the double ἔτι, combine this first ἔτι with the participial modifier, in the same manner as the second. Similar transpositions with adverbs, such as ἔτι, are not unusual in Greek.

Meanwhile, there is no real reason why ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν should be modified by a double ἔτι. For that reason, one is strongly tempted in this case to strike the second ἔτι, as many critics have dared to do in spite of its strong attestation. In view of these difficulties, it appears all the more necessary to test the less attested readings exactly. Certainly, the εἰς τὸ γὰρ in F,G and one of the corrections of Codex C (for which Klostermann energetically intercedes), absolutely does not fit the context. Such a question, "To what

purpose has Christ then died for the ungodly", " whose answer the reader himself must supply, would contrast with the peaceful symmetrical form of presentation of the preceding passage and run contrary to the entire argument of the Apostle. Here he operates with the fact that Christ has died for the sinners, for the ungodly, not with this fact as purpose. "A question regarding the purpose of the divine love would not be in place in this entire argumentation, since it does not treat here of the purpose, but of the special character of this love" (Godet).

On the other hand, the reading εἰ γάρ is contained in the version, Isid., Aug., and Pesch. Also, because the εἰ γε of the Vaticanus supports it and Schott, Ebrard and Luthardt have decided for it, it deserves all consideration. A copyist, who missed the apodosis in the conditional clause beginning with εἰ γάρ and read ἔτι twice in verses 6 and 8, might well have produced a third ἔτι out of the εἰ. And it is easier explained that ἔτι γάρ came from εἰ γάρ then from εἰς τὸ γάρ. Above all, however, the reading εἰ γάρ at the beginning of the sentence structure, starting at v. 6, is recommended by strong internal reasons. It is a favorite construction by Paul that he clothe a firmly established fact, which perhaps had been confirmed before, in the form of a condition, in order to infer another fact from it. In our passage the following sentence structure would emerge, "Then if Christ has died for the ungodly and God has thereby proven His incomparable love, as is actually the case (vv. 6-8), thus it follows that we are now so much the more saved from the future wrath (v. 9). The πολλῷ οὖν μάλλον "much more than," in v. 9 then introduces the apodosis, and the οὖν explains itself from the amplification of the protasis. The entire statement in vv. 6-9 is then, however, a further explanation and vindication of the statement contained in v. 5, that the love of God guarantees the fulfillment of our hope for the future glory.

One must here add the fact that this same construction is repeated three times in this chapter: vv. 10-11: "For if while we were enemies ... much more, having been reconciled...", Εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες...πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες

...; V. 15: "For if by the transgression of the one ... much more did the grace of God...", εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι...πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ.... V. 17: "For if by the transgression of the one ... much more those who receive ...", εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι...πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεύαν. What could make one finally err again in this interpretation of vv. 6-9 is the circumstance that ἔτι γάρ is more strongly attested than εἰ γάρ. Then, one must here stress the inner reasons than upon the outer. Moreover, the sense of the discourse remains essentially unchanged, even when

one firmly holds to the double ἔτι . In this case, though, in place of the strict grammatical logic, there is a looser train of thought. Verses 6-8, in the latter case, would be an interpretation of the concept "the love of God," ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ (v.5). In v. 9 the future deliverance from wrath would be inferred as an independent statement from the love of God which manifests itself in the death of Christ.

Now we would look more closely at the individual expressions contained in the section, vv. 6-9. The proof of the love of God, which the Apostle already had in mind in v. 5b and which had been repeatedly mentioned in the section beginning in 3:21, is that Christ has died for us, for the ungodly, ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε (v. 6). The ὑπὲρ , in similar connections where the suffering and death of Christ is spoken of, often signifies "instead of" or "in place of" (e.g. 1 Pe 3:18). We take, corresponding to the "for a righteous man," ὑπὲρ δικαίου and "for a good man," ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ (v. 7), in the general sense of "in favor of," "on behalf of," or "for the benefit of." Out of love to us, for our benefit, in order to redeem us, Christ has given Himself and laid down His own life. To be sure, His death, when one looks at the facts, was for our benefit only because He has died in our place.

The love and favor of Christ appears so much the greater and first comes into the true light when one adds that "we were still helpless," when Christ died, ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν ἔτι . The expression "helpless," ἀσθενεῖς does not point, as some have frequently taken it, to the wretched, helpless condition, in which we found ourselves previously, which called forth the helping love of God, since our weakness rather stands in contrast to the death of Christ. But it designates, as the parallel expressions ἀσεβεῖς "ungodly," (v. 6) and ἀμαρτωλοί "sinners," (v. 8) prove, the moral quality, the moral unworthiness and impotence of the persons for whom the sacrifice of Christ avails. We were sinful, ungodly, weak, entirely incapable of all good work; that is, we stood as sinful, ungodly men before God. We could not produce or make anything count before God, which would have directed God's good pleasure to us. That the Apostle here thinks of our former relationship to God is seen in the contrast δικαιωθέντες νῦν "now being justified," (v. 9).

In that he writes ἡμῶν , the Apostle includes himself with his Christian readers and with all his Christian contemporaries. He speaks here, as well as in the entire section, in the name of all those who have been justified by faith. He distinguishes two states in the life of the Christians of that time: the first,

when they were still weak; the second, when they had been justified by the death of Christ. But he does not have only his own contemporaries in mind. Because he uses the expression ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν instead of the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, he makes it clear that Christ has died for the ungodly in general. Thus, he points to the two great periods of the world - the period before Christ and the Christian period, which he here dates from the death of Christ. He characterizes the first as a time of weakness and sin, of general godlessness; the latter as a time when Christ and the righteousness in Christ which avails before God have been manifested to the children of men. He judges that the death of Christ has also retrospective power and that even before Christ there were righteous ones, who, like Abraham and David, had been justified by faith, as well as the fact that, since Christ has come and died, sin and godlessness are still to be found on the earth. The difference of time for him, however, finally coincides with a difference of situation, the contrast being between the condition of things of Christ and the Christian condition.

Likewise we, whose life falls in the New Testament era, can still speak today as the Apostle spoke here, that, when we were still weak, the death of Christ has come for our benefit. We are completely, by nature and birth, weak, sinful and ungodly. But now, as a result of the salutary effect of the death of Christ, we have passed from the condition of sin into the condition of righteousness. And now the Apostle emphasizes that, when we were "still," ἔτι, weak, Christ died for the ungodly, whom He found as such. He emphasizes that Christ's death, love and favor enter into this condition of weakness, sin and godlessness and that the moral unworthiness of man was lessened and alleviated by nothing until Christ entered in with His sacrifice for them. Man had done nothing and could have done nothing which might have given him a better appearance before God.

To the statement of verse 6, however, there is added the more explicit term, κατὰ καιρόν "at the right time." Some commentators refer this to the preceding. Fritzsche combines ἔτι κατὰ καιρόν in the sense of "at the time when." But then κατὰ καιρόν is a very idle addition. It is an idle addition also when one, with Luthardt and older commentators, refers these words to the entire participial clause and translates, "when we were still according to time." A more distorted thought, on the other hand, comes forth, when others, like Schott, Weiss and Ebrard, translate, "when we were still in consequence of the time," in that the time brings with it such weakness. For the evil time did not make men evil, but ungodly men had made the time before Christ into a time of general ungodliness.

With most exegetes, therefore, we combine κατὰ καιρόν with the following principal clause, "Christ died for the ungodly," Χριστός...ὕπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε. However, not in the sense that Hofmann and Klostermann wanted, that Christ died only with regard to the time, not in general for the ungodly. That would say that He has died in a time of general godlessness. For Christ has died simply and exclusively for the ungodly, since all men are and were by nature ungodly. Just as little can we agree with Meyer, who would have the Apostle say that Christ died just at the right time for the ungodly, namely, for the generation of that time, before they died in their godlessness. That leads to the strange thought that Christ's redemption benefited only His contemporaries. We take the expression κατὰ καιρόν in our passage, as in John 5:4 and with Grimm, Bengel, Schierlitz, De Wette, Rueckert, Tholuck, Philippi, Godet and Hodge in the meaning "established time," tempore statuto, and understand the apostolic expression thus: that Christ has died for the ungodly at the time determined by God. Correctly, these expositors point to such parallels as Ga 4:4; 1 Tm 2:6; Tt 1:3, where it is said, "God has sent His Son in the fulness of time," ὅτε ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου ; that Christ "in His own time," καιροῦς ἰδίου , has given Himself as a ransom for all; that God "in His own time," καιροῦς ἰδίου , has revealed His Word.

It is not difficult to understand why Paul has called special attention to this point in this place. Just at such a time as is described in the context of our passage, which was described before in the first chapter of our Letter, God has provided for the carrying out of His decree of redemption. Exactly at the time when godlessness had increased to the uttermost, when the sickness of man had reached the greatest crisis, the doctor should appear and bring healing to the terminally ill. This serves only to the greatness of God and the glory of divine grace.

What that means is that Christ died for the ungodly when we were still without strength. This kind of love is explained and illustrated by the Apostle in v. 7 by comparing it with human love. It reads in v. 7a, "For one will hardly die for a righteous man," μὴ τις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανείται . So it is among men, that one would hardly die for a righteous one. The contrast to "for the ungodly," ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν , in v. 6 and absence of a definite article demands that one takes δικαίου as masculine. And this statement is confirmed by the following, "though perhaps for the good man someone would dare even to die," ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν (v. 7b). One commonly sees here an argument ex contrario. Some understand τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ also as a masculine, but make a difference between a "righteous man," δίκαιος and a "good man,"

ἀγαθός , in that the latter is placed much higher. Further, an improper distinction is made between "hardly," μόλις , and "perhaps," τάχα , and the Apostle is made to say the following: "Hardly does one die for a righteous man, although that is not altogether excluded." If, conversely, it deals with a good man, then it happens much easier and sooner that one offers his life for him. The difference between a righteous and a good man has been decided in various ways. A δίκαιος is supposed to be one who has done nothing to harm anyone; an ἀγαθός one who positively does good. A δίκαιος is a simple righteous man; an ἀγαθός is one who combines highmindedness with righteousness. A δίκαιος is one who does everything that the Law demands and whose character commands respect; an ἀγαθός one whose action is guided by love and inspires love. A δίκαιος is one who in regard to a specific reproach, is acknowledged as innocent; the ἀγαθός is in all factors unblamable. A δίκαιος is an upright man; while the ἀγαθός is a noble man, a benefactor, a pater patriae. The great variety and diversity of these definitions demonstrates the untenability of such a distinction.

In profane as well as in Biblical Greek δίκαιος and ἀγαθός are used as synonyms and are used indiscriminately. Mt 5:45, "He causes His sun to rise on the evil and on the good (ἀγαθοῦς), and sends rain on the righteous (δίκαιούς) and on the unrighteous." Luke 23:50, "a good and righteous man," ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός καὶ δίκαιος . Ro 7:12, "The commandment is holy and righteous and good," ἡ ἐντιωλή ἀγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή . Further, it is strange in the terms under discussion that ἀγαθός has the article and that a double contrast is given for "for the ungodly," ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν . A fitting difference between δικαίου and τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ (and we must establish a difference if we would not attribute a tautology to the Apostle) we can make only when we, because of the article and with Luther, Melanchthon, Rueckert, Godet, Hofmann, Otto, Weiss, and Luthardt, take τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ as a neuter and translate, "though perhaps for the sake of the good one actually undertakes to die." The good is then the general category, to which also a δίκαιος belongs. And this statement is then the foundation for the possibility which is introduced with μόλις , that in the end one still dies for a righteous one. The meaning and thought connection of the Apostle is accordingly as follows: Among men it is so, that one might really undertake or dare (καὶ τολμᾷ) to die for the good; that one offers his life for that which has real moral worth, in order to prevent this value from coming to ruin. And so it might happen though not easily or frequently, that one might die for a righteous one, in consideration of the good that is found in him.

Thus in v. 6 the ungodly is simply contrasted to the righteous one, who can show some good. Self-evidently, Paul speaks here only of that which is righteous, good, and lovely in the natural sphere; that is, of "civil righteousness" (justitia civilis), in which, before the eyes of God, man remains what he is by nature, an ἀσεβής. .

So much human love can accomplish, but only in the most favorable and rare case. The love of God is totally different. The Apostle has already shown its characteristics in vv. 5b-6, and now again makes it prominent, "But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν (v. 8). God proves His love to us in that which Christ has done. God and Christ stand on the same level. It is the love of God in Christ which Paul praises here. The present συνίστησι, "demonstrates," is explained in the fact that the salutary effect of the death of Christ continues throughout all times. The simple ὅτι is a shortened expression for "in this," ἐν τούτῳ. The emphasis here also lies in the fact that Christ has died for us when we were still sinners and had improved in no way. God has given His Son, Christ has given Himself into death, for such people as were thoroughly sinful and evil, possessing no moral worth, worthy of no love, with whom likewise nothing was lost if they had been lost. That is the unique, incomparable love of God, which surpasses all thought. It far, far excels all human demonstrations and thoughts of love.

And from these facts, that God has loved us so ardently that Christ has died for us sinners, the Apostle now draws the conclusion, "Much more than ... we shall be saved from the wrath through Him," πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον...σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς (v. 9). This conclusion is, as already remarked above, also a strict grammatical conclusion, if we take v. 9 as an apodosis to a protasis beginning with εἰ γάρ in v. 6. If (and because) that is so, as has been shown previously, then we shall now also be saved much more certainly through Him. Through Christ, we are surely saved from wrath; really, before the wrath falls on us, so that we remain preserved from the wrath which on that day shall come upon all godless men who have remained godless even unto the end. In the conclusion, however, the Apostle adds the parenthetical statement "having now been justified by His blood," δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, and thereby recapitulates the premise contained in vv. 6-8. From this, he concludes the future deliverance, in order to make the conclusion so much more enlightening. The content of this participial clause evidently coincides with the content of the preceding verses.

The expression "in His blood," ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ points back to the reference to the death of Christ and characterizes it as a violent, bloody death and thereby makes God's loving sacrifice appear so much greater. And "having now been justified," δικαιοθέντες νῦν, explains how far the death of Christ has served for our benefit. Through Christ's death and blood we have been justified.

The δικαιοθῆναι is also presented here as the immediate effect of the death of Christ, which had already been established and given with the Christ's death. This is proved outside of the context of our passage also by "we were reconciled," καταλλαγέντες (v. 10), which is parallel and synonymous to δικαιοθέντες. Christ has died for all godless men and has justified them all through His death. But the believing Christians are those who have made this benefit of Christ their own, and who continually take advantage of it and draw profit from it. From it, they draw the conclusion and speak and acknowledge with the Apostle, "Thus we are now justified, and, after we have been justified, we also have been saved from the wrath." This conclusion of faith, to which the Apostle leads up to, is, as one is accustomed to say and as most expositors remark, a conclusion from great to small (a majori ad minus). The greater thing has happened, therefore the lesser shall certainly not be excluded. This is the greatest benefit of God and the principal proof of the love of God - that Christ has died for the godless and has shed His blood for us, and of this love we are assured through the Spirit of God. Therefore we need not doubt that we shall also experience on that day love from God, not wrath. We were formerly ungodly, but now we have been justified through Christ's death and blood, and have been changed from godless to righteous people. Thus, we are now justified before God, completely justified, as God would have us. Therefore we do not have to fear that on that day God's wrath and displeasure shall befall us. The transformation of the godless to the righteous is greater than the other change, that the justified become saved. The first change guarantees the latter. Through Christ we will be saved from wrath. Christ, who shall return on that day and fulfill God's judgment on the world, shall certainly intercede for and preserve from the wrath those for whom He has sacrificed His heart's blood, whom He has made pure and righteous through His blood.

The conclusion is repeated in v. 10 with other words, permitting its certainty to stand out even more significantly, "For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life," εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ.

The γάρ at the beginning of this statement marks it as an explanation of the preceding. The Apostle here operates with the contrast between the former relationship of enemies and the present relationship of reconciliation. Baur, Beck and Ritschl take "enemies," ἐχθροί, actively, concerning our enmity against God, and "we were reconciled," καταλλάγημεν, and "having been reconciled," καταλλαγέντες, subjectively, concerning the change in men which has been called for by the death of Christ and the love of God, as a result of which we are now well-disposed toward God. "This interpretation, however," as Weiss correctly remarks, "contradicts the entire context, which does not treat of a change of the human disposition toward God, but of justification and its results. It would attribute to 'much more,' πολλῷ μᾶλλον, an entirely different motif from that in v. 9, where it points not to the greater worthiness of man in himself, but to the greater proof of love which we already experience and for which we still hope." Ἐχθρός is also found in a passive meaning. Ro 11:28: "From the standpoint of the Gospel they are enemies for your sake, but from the standpoint of (God's) choice they are beloved for the sake of the fathers," κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροὶ δι' ὑμᾶς κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοὺς πατέρας. And καταλλάσσειν designates the change in God's disposition especially where the discussion is concerning the salutary act of God. See 2 Cor 5:19, where "that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, is explained by the following clause, "not counting their trespasses against them," μὴ λογισζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν. In our passage, this latter meaning for καταλλάγημεν, aside from the context, is beyond question because of the parallel expression, "through whom we have now received the reconciliation," δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν in v. 11, which characterizes the reconciliation as a gift of God to men. Thus with most of the ancient and modern expositors, we understand that which Paul says here concerning the reconciliation of the enemy as "a restoration into a relationship to God wherein we no longer have Him against us, and not a restoration into a condition, wherein we are no longer against Him" (Hofmann).

The modifying phrase of καταλλάγημεν also supports this: "through the death of His Son," διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. The idea is raised that our reconciliation is worked immediately through the death of Christ, that it has happened and is completed in and with Christ's death. We owe our reconciliation to the death of Christ. Christ is here expressly named "God's Son." The divinity of Christ weighs heavily on the scales and gives to the death of Christ its incomparable, unending worth. The death of the Son of God sufficed to still

the wrath of the most high God, to move God to give up His enmity against sinful men, who are hated by Him. Also in this passage it is emphasized that the blessing of Christ was applied precisely to the opposing state of mankind. While we were enemies and had God against us without this relationship of enmity having been lessened or modified in any degree, then this great and wonderful change came. Then God's Son entered in for us, took wrath and enmity upon Himself and expiated that wrath through suffering and death. Thus Christ changed our relationship of enmity to God into a relationship of friendship and turned God's grace and pleasure toward us.

And now the conclusion: If we, when we were still enemies, were reconciled to God through the death of His Son (and this is really the case), then now, after we have been reconciled, we shall be saved so much more readily. This is the conclusion reached by believing Christians, who have rightly known and applied to themselves the blessing of Christ; that is, the reconciliation which has taken place through Christ. If the more difficult thing has happened, then surely the easier thing will follow. The change of the hostility of God into the friendship of God, this greatest and most important change, guarantees the final change, which we still await. This final change is also here portrayed as a being saved, σωθησόμεθα. However, in our verse this is modified by "by His life," ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. Most frequently they translate this: as "through His life," and explain this translation in different ways. Meyer, Hofmann and others understand "through His life" as identical with "through the living Christ." The living Christ shall on that day keep His own against the wrath. Besides the contrast between "enemies," ἐχθροί and "having been reconciled," καταλλαγέντες they propose another: between "through the death of God's Son," διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, and "through His life," ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. They suppose that, with reference to its completion, the future deliverance is the easier and lesser in comparison with the already established reconciliation. In order to bring this about, the sacrifice of Christ's life was necessary. For our future deliverance, only the activity of the Risen Christ is necessary. Nevertheless, "through His life" would still be a strange designation of the living Christ. And one does not understand why Paul did not write "from the wrath," ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς, which must be supplied here. Very correctly, in our opinion, Weiss points to another antithesis, that of "from the wrath," ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς (v. 9b) and "by His life," ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ (v. 10b). One can very well translate, "we will be saved into his life." With verbs of motion, the end (terminus) of the motion is often introduced with ἐν instead of ἐς. "has been poured within our hearts," ἐκκέχεται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (v. 5)]. The meaning of the Apostle would then be,

"We shall be saved from the wrath, into the life of Christ, in the life of the glory of God (Weiss)." That thought is very proper in the context of our passage. One expects a mention of the positive side of our hope, where Paul would more firmly establish the fulfillment of our Christian hope, which reaches toward the glory of God. More precisely, this would read: If and after we are reconciled to God by the death of the Son of God, then we shall certainly one day live and dwell as reconciled children with Christ together with God, in the heavenly home of the Father. A certain reference of the "by His life," ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ, to the διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 10a) is also not excluded in this case. As we have now become partakers of the fruit of the death of Christ, reconciliation with God, so shall we one day share in the life of Christ, the blessed life of glory.

But the Apostle is still not entirely finished with these conclusions. He still adds the words, "And not only this, but we also exult in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation," οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν (v. 11). The participle "we exult in God," καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ, cannot possibly stand in the place of a verbum finitum nor adapt itself as a modifier to σωθησόμεθα, but is to be coordinated with the καταλλαγέντες in v. 10. Thus it belongs to the premise from which the future salvation is concluded. We are saved and translated into the life of Christ after we have been reconciled to God. Not only that, but we also have been reconciled so that we now boast in God. There is a difference between reconciliation and reconciliation. Among men it is such that one who had an enemy and has been reconciled to him may still not trust his former enemy, but keeps himself far from him in order not to provoke him further and to avoid a new outbreak of his wrath. He is satisfied if the reconciled enemy only leaves him alone, henceforth causes him no injury, and expects and asks no favor of him.

The reconciliation of God is very different. This is a perfect, basic reconciliation. It is the warmest friendship. It brings with it the fact that we now also rejoice and glory in our God. Whoever is reconciled to God through Christ holds it as completely impossible that he would ever again be at enmity with God. He takes pleasure in his God and his unconditional confidence in God. He expects only good from God. Luther comments on Ro 5:11, "We glory in God, that He is our God and we are His, and have all blessings in common with Him and have all confidence in Him." Such joy and confidence certainly is not firm when we look at ourselves and consider how we provoke God with our daily sins. But

we glory in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the reconciliation has been imparted to us and who has atoned and paid for all the sins of our life by His death. If it is so between ourselves and God, that we have not only been reconciled with Him but also rejoice and glory in Him as our God, then how can we still doubt that also on that day we shall receive nothing evil but only good from Him and that He shall one day give us a share in the blessings of His house and in the joys of eternal life? We can really be completely certain of our eternal salvation.

The Apostle has proven what he wanted to prove - namely, that our hope does not make us ashamed. And such certain hope of salvation belongs to the effects of justification. What St. Paul says in this section concerning the relationship between justification and the future "salvation," σωτηρία, instructive and, like everything that is joined with the article of justification, highly comforting. Many times we Christians think too little of our present possession. We suppose that having been justified through Christ and having received reconciliation through Him, we are only on the first step along the way to salvation and that the final goal still lies far away. It is thought that the passage out of time into eternity is the real deciding step, that is the critical point (punctum criticum), of how we shall stand on that day before God. But no, it is not so. The greatest and the most important thing has already taken place. The deciding step, the punctum criticum, lies behind us. The crisis has already been met. We are reconciled to God through Christ's death. We are just and good before God through Christ. Our account with God has been set right. And with that our eternal fate is already decided. Eternal salvation is the necessary, at the same time the very self-evident, consequence of our justification. The distance between sin and righteousness is far, far greater than the distance between righteousness and salvation, and we are already over the greatest, deepest gulf. Out of the state of sin (status peccati) we have entered into the state of grace (status gratiae) over into the state of glory (status gloriae). This is the essential thing, the greatest point: we are in the clear with God and have Him for us. It is less essential whether we rejoice and glory in our God here in this weak tabernacle of the body, under the tribulations of this time, or there in the blessed life of glory. But also the latter is not excluded, because the principal factor has been decided. Certainly we would like to be saved. We yearn for the glory of God. But this is the right way to the goal: not that we look into the future, but that we absorb all senses and thoughts in the present grace, the grace of justification. The more firmly we take root there, the

nearer we are to heaven. These are salutary thoughts, which the preceding discussion of the Apostle, especially the πολλῷ μᾶλλον, arouses in us.

Finally, there is a misunderstanding yet to be rejected, one which the preceding conclusions of the Apostle could give rise to. That Paul here, by strong reasoning and sharp conclusions and inferences, discloses the future salvation from justification, no other teachers of Christianity are thereby given a right to set up similar conclusions. It gives a teacher no right to draw a doctrine out of another doctrine which is given in the Scriptures, even if the conclusion is ever so plausible. The true theology is a theology of the Scriptures and goes not a hair's breadth beyond the thoughts which the Scriptures present in clear words. The conclusions with which we have engaged ourselves are - that we may never dare forget - the conclusions of the Apostle. Here he has also written, concluded, and inferred, having been moved by the Holy Ghost. These conclusions are constituent parts of the Scriptures and, for that reason, are also binding for us. And when the Apostle, as he does here in Ro 5:6-11, places such conclusions in the mouths of Christians, he teaches and calls upon the Christians to conclude and infer the same. Therefore, it belongs to the obedience of faith that we make these words and deductions of the Apostle and the Scriptures our own, so that we repeat that which the Holy Ghost has told us.

Summary of the section 5:1-11: The Apostle describes the blessed effects of justification, which are peace with God and the certain hope of the future glory, which is guaranteed to us by God's love, Christ's death, and our justification and reconciliation.

5:12-21. The First and the Second Adam.

5:12-14.

There follows, in vv. 12-21, a long extended statement of comparison, a "grandiose parallel" between Adam and Christ. The salvation which we owe to Christ is contrasted to the harm which we have inherited from Adam and is illustrated by the contrast. Some expositors, like Koppe, Umbreit, Schott and Lange, join this portion very closely with that immediately preceding it. They suppose that with "just as," ὥσπερ (v. 12), the second half of the comparison is introduced. They supply the first half out of the words of verse 11, with the sense: Therefore we have now received reconciliation through Christ, just as sin through Adam and, through sin, death which came into the world. Or: Therefore, we shall be saved through Christ's life the same as we have, through Adam,

inherited sin and, thereby, death. Or, more generally: Therefore it is with Christ as with Adam, etc.

But it is obvious that a new section begins with "Therefore, just as," *Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ*, with v. 12, and that the discussion is, first, concerning Adam and then, secondly, concerning Christ. The questions, "To what does the *Διὰ τοῦτο* refer?", and "How is the connection of the entire passage to the preceding presentation of the Apostle to be taken?", we shall best be able to answer after we better understand its content. Other questions, however, such as, "Where does the protasis introduced with *ὥσπερ* finds its apodosis in the following?" and, "Is there an apodosis present at all?", shall answer themselves in the course of the discussion. "Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin," *Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ διὰ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος* - thus the new section begins. Sin and death are the two subjects of which Paul first considers and which he repeatedly names in the first half of the comparison, vv. 12-14. The verb "to sin," *ἁμαρτάνειν* designates, as does the Hebrew *אָפַק*, a "missing the mark, but obviously the reference is to missing a mark appointed by God because the human conduct misses its goals and, thereby, the will of God" (Cremer). Or: "Failure in making the God-willed goal, deviation from the God-pleasing things, fulfillment of the things to which God is averse" (Delitzsch). Or: "Every action conflicting with the holy will of God, whether it is evident inwardly or outwardly" (Hofmann). The noun "sin," *ἁμαρτία*, is used in a double manner, abstractly and concretely, as Cremer expresses it. First it is used as a concept of a species, especially in the Pauline writings; secondly, as a single sinful action, as far as the name of the species is suitable to the individual example. Or, the general concept is applied to the specific case, as Grimm distinguishes it: first, in the sense of *τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν*, "sin, sinning" (peccatus, peccatio), secondly, in the sense of "that which is sinned, the sin, the crime, whether by thought or deed against the law of God," (id quod peccatur, peccatum, delictum, cogitatum vel factum divinae legi contrarium). For the first meaning, both lexicographers use Ro 5:12 as the first example.

And concerning sin, it is now said in our passage that it has entered into the world. "World," *κόσμος* does not here designate the universe, but, as often, the world of men or the earth which God had designed and prepared for the children of men. The thought that evil had entered into the sublunar world out of the spirit world where it had previously existed is certainly correct in itself,

but lies entirely outside of the context. In this entire section, Paul has in view only that which has happened on earth: the history, conduct and destiny of man. What he says concerning sin, he predicates in the second part of the sentence in reference to death. However, with regard to death he expressly distinguishes the "came into the world", εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, from the "spread to all men", διελθεῖν εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. Thus, εἰσελθεῖν, the entering of sin into the world, cannot mean, as some have frequently taken it, that sin affects the entire world of men and has spread itself over all mankind. Εἰσερχεσθαι is used to describe the entrance of Christ into the world (He 10:5; 1 Tm 1,15), and the appearance of the erring spirits, the anti-Christ 2 Jn 7). And, if in this text, the same predicate is attached to sin as to death, or if Ga 3:23 reads "But before faith came", πρὸ τοῦ ἔλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, then sin, death, and faith are personified.

The meaning is that sin, death and faith have entered into the world. They have made their appearance on earth, which is to say, they have begun to exist. Fritzche remarks fittingly: Εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον means nothing more than 'to begin to be.' ...In the phrase εἰσηλθε τί εἰς τὸν κόσμον usually this one thing is contemplated: something begins to exist, that did not exist before...A man enters into the world when he is born, or a thing, when it first exercises its power, as ὁ θάνατος, or is first committed, as a crime. In wisdom of Sol 14:4, it is said of the idols, "Through the vanity of men they entered the world, and therefore their speedy end has been planned." These words characterize the beginning and origin of the idols of idol worship. That the idols entered the world" coincides with the fact that they are imagined by men. And, thus, the statement that sin has come into the world signifies nothing else than that it has made its beginning on earth. At first sin was not in the world - but then a change entered in and ever since sin has been in the world. But that sin has entered into the world and has begun to exist, happened by one man, namely, Adam. The stress lies on the "through one man", δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, which is placed first. This one man, the first man Adam, sinned and walked contrary to the holy will of God, and thereby sin made its appearance on earth. With that, sin entered into existence. The sin of Adam was the beginning and origin of all human transgression.

"And death through sin", καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος From the first part of the sentence not only εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσηλθε is to be applied to this clause, but also the emphatic δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου which is at the beginning of the sentence of comparison. By one man, through sin, death has come into the world. Adam sinned and the effect and punishment of his sin was death. In and with the death of Adam, death entered into the world and made its appearance on earth and began to exist.

The death of Adam was the beginning of human death. "Death, ὁ θάνατος , designates primarily physical death, but it also often designates the final, terrible destiny of sinful man, eternal death (2 Cor 2:16; 7:10; Jas 1:15; 5:20; 1 Jn 5:16). Death is, as Cremer expresses it, once the end of this natural life, another time the opposite of the true life which is from God and with God, eternal life. We also speak of a "spiritual death," and this idiom is based in the Scriptures. In Eph. 2:1-5, we read that we were dead in sins. Also, we use the word "death" or "dead" in a figurative sence, referring to moral deadness and the complete inability of the natural man to do any good. Death, in the real sense of the word, is not a moral quality, but the fate which man has brought upon himself by conduct which is contrary to God.

Even in the present section, the concepts "sin", ἀμαρτία , and "death", θάνατος , are sharply distinguished from one another. Thus, the conduct and the fate of man are also distinguished from one another. Cremer concludes his examination of the concept "death", θάνατος , in the New Testament with the statement "In the commonly accepted meaning of spiritual moral deadness, θάνατος (the noun) is not found in the New Testament." In this text, as in the entire passage of vv.12-21, Paul understands θάνατος as death in the full sense of the word, as the total punishment of sin, both physical death and eternal death together. Or we can say that physical death, for sinful man who dies in his sins, becomes eternal death. The two meanings do not lie outside of one another, but in one another. Weiss remarks correctly, "To be sure, θάνατος often is used concerning eternal death, but that is not another meaning of the word since physical death, if it is not again raised up through the resurrection to eternal life, self-evidently becomes eternal death." That here the Apostle has in mind this final consequence of physical death, that is, eternal death, is apparent also from the fact that in v.21 he contrasts "eternal life", ζωὴ αἰώνιος , with "death", θάνατος . When he writes, "and death by sin", he refers to the threat and punishment of God, "In the day that you eat from it you shall surely die" (Gn 2:17) and "You are dust, and to dust you shall return" (Gn 3:19). God had sentenced the first man to death and decay after he had sinned and had eaten of the forbidden fruit. On the same day that he ate, the carrying out of the threat, the execution of the sentence of death, began. On the same day the seed of death was planted into his nature. From that hour on, his body was a mortal body, in which one sees all the symptoms of death and decay. "The threat of death in Gn 2,17 reads not "you shall be put to death:, מָוֹתָ, but "you shall die", מָוֹתָ. It is no contradiction in that death comes, not as a momentary act, but as a process beginning from that moment when its final outcome was announced to man. Men died when they fell into sin, as when Ephraim died when he bowed down to Baal (Hb 13:1

Their life is henceforth a slow but sure ripening of the seed of death, which they carry within themselves" (Delitzsch).

Death entered into the world immediately after the fall into sin. It came in and with the destined punishment which Adam bore, and not first with the murder of Abel. The threat of death reads, "you shall surely die", $\text{וְיָדַעְתָּ} \text{ וְיָמָו}$, For the death of the first man God had used this strong, full expression. When Adam sinned, he tasted immediately the full terror of death and had a foretaste of hell and damnation also. With his sin Adam had forfeited his life; precisely, the blessed life of communion with God and the glory into which he would have passed gradually if he would have withstood the test (Cp. 1 Cor 15:46). Adam had become subject to death because of his sin and according to the law, subject to eternal death. He would have become and remained a prey of eternal death if the promise of the Seed of the woman and faith in that promise had not entered into the process of death and averted the worst consequences.

The third part of the sentence, "and so death spread to all men", is the goal of the comparative statement. In any case, death is the subject of the statement, even if one accepts the more weakly attested reading which does not include the $\acute{\omicron} \theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$. With $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \alpha\acute{\nu}\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\nu$, the spread of death over all mankind is described. Death had, first of all, in and with Adam's death, set its foot into the world, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon$. It then passed upon, $\delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\nu$, all mankind. It has taken possession of all the children of Adam. Death, as it were, accompanies the spread of the human race. All men, from conception and birth, are subject to death. Every child of Adam, every man who is born into the world, brings along a mortal, weak, frail body. His entire life is a movement toward death, and when he has ceased to live and has died, then he falls away as the flower of the grass and becomes earth, dust and ashes. Yes, if nothing intervenes, he must die eternally and becondemned. However, emphasis in this portion of the sentence lies on the "so", $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$, which goes back to the stressed "through one man", $\delta\epsilon \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \alpha\acute{\nu}\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$. Through one man, by means of his sin, death has passed upon all men. This reference of $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ is confirmed by the expression "Through the one who sinned", $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\epsilon \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (v.16), which refers to v.12. The sin of the one man, Adam is the cause not only of his own death but of the death of all men. It is not the individuals, each for himself, who first incurred death for their sins. This fact testifies that every man from the first, from the very beginning of his existence, is subject to death. Hofmann writes, "The express distinction that first sin, and death through sin, has come into the world, has led to the misunderstanding of the reference with which the Apostle continues when he writes, "and so death spread to all men," $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \alpha\acute{\nu}\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\omicron} \theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\nu$. This is as if $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ referred to the causal connection

between sin and death. ... But one should first consider that then the comparison would have to be death came to the first man, and not how it came into the world by one man. And secondly, "through sin". διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, is in a subordinate position in the sentence, which is governed by the initial δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου. It cannot be the element which is emphasized in the reference to this sentence. Οὕτως must refer to δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου. The contrasting manner of death coming upon all men would have been that every single individual would draw it down upon himself. But, instead of that, death was in the world once, for all times, by one man through sin; thus, when it came into the world by him through sin, it has passed upon all men. The expression διῃλθεν follows, as it were, the branching out of the many-membered race which has stemmed from the one. In opposition to εἰσοῆλθεν, in this sense it corresponds to the emphasis of the οὕτως and is not emphasized less than οὕτως. Οὕτως, accordingly, designates not 'in the course of this, that through one man death had come into the world', and not 'accordingly, because death has come into the world through sin', but 'in the previously described form and manner'. Specifically, that through one man's sin death had come into the world. But then the fact under discussion is not how sin and death, but merely how death, has passed upon all men." Yes, one dare not overlook this fact, as many expositors have done although it is very clear that the Apostle speaks not of sin, but merely of death and that it has passed upon all men. True, the Scriptures teach elsewhere that sin also has been transmitted from Adam to all men, and that in every man sin, like death, has been implanted. But of this the Apostle speaks no word in our passage. Here he only asserts the fact that death has spread over all humanity and traces this fact back to the "one that sinned".

The next words "because all sinned", ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, have been variously interpreted and have been counted among the crosses of interpreters (cruces interpretum). We record here and shed light on only the most current conceptions. Some have taken ἐπὶ in the sense of "in", ᾧ as a masculine dative of the relative pronoun and referred it back to δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου and translate, "in whom, certainly Adam, all have sinned". This is the meaning proposed by Origen and introduced into the church by Augustine, but it is grammatically inadmissible. For ἐπὶ is never so much as "in" and δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου lies too far back to be correlated to ᾧ. Whether the sense of the sentence, disregarding the construction, and whether the sentence all in Adam have sinned is correct in itself and renders the meaning of the Apostle, will become clear in the further course of this discussion. Hofmann likewise takes ᾧ as masculine, but he refers it to ὁ θάνατος, and translates ἐπὶ as "with", rendering, "with

this experience". To demonstrate this idiom, he appeals to 2 Macc 2:8, "at the time of Moses", ἐπὶ Μωϋσῆ , and He 9:15, in the time of the first covenant ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ . He explains the sense of the translation with, "Individuals have come into the world after death was already in the world. When they transgressed, they transgressed in the face of death which, by one, had come upon them all. They did not, individually, draw death upon themselves by their transgression. This means that death was present in the transgression of all those upon whom it had come. It did not come about and originate only through their transgression nor always for the individuals who sinned."

These statements are correct in themselves and designate exactly the relationship of death to the transgression of the individual in the sense of the Apostle. Nevertheless, ignoring the fact that ἐφ' ᾧ would be a very awkward expression for οὗ παρόντος or ὅς παρῶν πρόν , such a statement concerning the transgression of the individual would be an entirely incidental remark which does not fit into the connection of vv.12-14 and which has no correlate in the parallel concerning Christ. This also speaks against the interpretation of Thomasius, who essentially agrees with Hofmann, only that he understands ἐφ' ᾧ as a neuter, "in the presence of which circumstance." The translation of Luther, "for that all have sinned", is now almost unanimously adapted and recognized, in that ἐφ' ᾧ is as much as ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι . Of the quotations from profane writings which Meyer used as proof of this meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ , ἐφ' οἷς , we mention here only the example of Favorinus, "because you have practiced thievery, you will be punished", ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν κλοπὴν εἰργάσω, κολασθήσῃ . In the New Testament ἐφ' ᾧ is found in two other places, and evidently in the sense of (quia) "because": καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκηναί στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι, ἐφ' ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι, "For indeed while we are in this tent, we groan, being burdened, because we do not want to be unclothed, but to be clothed", (II Cor. 5:4); and δυνάμει καὶ κατελάβω, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ , "but I press on in order that I may lay hold of that for which also I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ", (Php 3:12).

But now the question is, "How is this sentence, 'because all sinned', to be understood?" Most modern expositors take ἡμᾶρτον as "the individual sins of individuals" and understand the Apostle as saying that death has passed upon all men and all must die because they have all actually sinned. Thus, for example, Baur, Rueckert, Tholuck, Fritzsche, De Wette, Ewald, Umbreit, Lange, Weiss, and Luthardt. In this case, the Apostle would be saying just the opposite of that which, according to our understanding, he had said in the preceding three-

part principal clause. In order not to permit him to fall into such striking self-contradiction, these expositors have felt obligated to dispose of the preceeding thought that sin also has passed upon all men. That the text does not permit this, we have already proven. The correct understanding of the words ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου...διῃλθεν, "therefore, just as through one man ... death spread to all men", that is, the thought that the sin of the one man is the cause of the death of all men, positively excludes the idea that individuals, with their individual sins, have first drawn death to themselves. And it is a vain endeavor when Luthardt, who essentially explains the first three parts of the verse correctly, seeks to unite these two statements with the rather obscure remark: "Thus there is an (imputatio peccati Adamiti), imputation of the sin of Adam but it is transmitted through one's own transgression. The understanding is that this is conditioned first by the sin which came into the world through Adam."

Thus, there is nothing else left other than with Bengel, Koppe, Meyer, Philippi, Delitzsch, Kahnis, Godet and Hodge, to take the sentence "for all sinned" as the fact that they have all sinned in and with Adam, or that they have sinned Adame peccante or eo ipso actu, quo Adamus peccavit. A similar expression is found in 2 Cor 5:14, "if one died for all, then all died", εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον. That means, in and with Christ, through His death, all have died. And, so, in and with Adam all have sinned. "The objection that the essential definition would be added arbitrarily is incorrect; for only that definition of ἥμαρτον is maintained which the immediate connection has necessarily prepared." (Meyer). The Apostle had previously said that by the sin of one man death had passed upon all men. This statement he confirmed by the fact that they all have sinned because the one man sinned. Because the sin of Adam was the sin of all men, it therefore brought death to all men. Consequently Augustine's statement, "All have sinned in Adam" (omnes in Adamo peccaverant), is true. But one dare not include the grossly sensuous concept that all men had already existed "in the loins of Adam" (in lumbis Adami), as if they all, because their will was decided in the will of their ancestor, had in fact (de facto) committed that first sin. To what extent Adam's sin was the sin of all man is explained by Paul in the parallel statement in v. 19: "through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners", διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί. By the disobedience of one man, many, meaning all men, have been exposed as sinners. They have been placed before God, and now stand before Him, as sinners. God regards them all as sinners because of the disobedience of Adam.

Or, in other words, God has imputed the sin of Adam to all men.

Finally, we call attention to the fact that this interpretation of Ro 5:12 is justified by the entire succeeding discussion, especially by such expressions as, "By the transgression of the one the many died", τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον (v.15); "by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one", τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς (v.17). Also see 1 Cor 15:22, "in Adam all die", ἐν τῷ Ἀδᾶμ πάντες ἀποθανήσκουσιν. These statements express, with somewhat different words, exactly the same things as the statement with which the Apostle began the section under discussion.

As a proof for the above statement, a historical fact is now introduced with "for", γάρ (vv.13-14). Paul points to the time "until the law", ἄρχῃ νόμου; thus, to the time before the Law. At that time, sin was in the world. Still, where there is no Law, sin shall not be imputed, ἐλλογεῖται. As in Phm 18, this means, as the following shows, that it is not charged to the account of man by God as a transgression of a divine commandment. Similarly, 4"15 reads, "where there is no law, neither is there violation". But still death reigned, ἐβασίλευσεν, from Adam until Moses, "even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam," καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ (v.14). These latter words are coordinated with the designated time "from Adam until Moses", ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωυσέως.

The Apostle states two things concerning the reign of death. First, over which time period it extended: from Adam to Moses; and second, who its victims were. Death ruled not only over those who have sinned like Adam by transgressing a law, as it has over the men of the Mosaic and post-Mosaic time, but also or even καὶ over those who have not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam - the men who lived from Adam until Moses. There are not, as Fritzsche and Meyer suppose, two classes distinguished among the latter: those who sinned without the Law and those who had and transgressed a law. Paul had previously designated the time before Moses simply as a law-less time. The people of that first period of the world, from Adam til Moses, had sinned; but since they had no positive law, they did not sin "in the likeness of the offense of Adam".

We understand ἐπὶ as concerning the norm. This is the same thing as, with Cremer, taking ὁμοίωμα in the concrete meaning "form," and referring the expression of Paul to the fact that the sin of those first men did not have the form of the sin of Adam, the form of transgression. Except that one would then have expected ἐν ὁμοιώματι. The sin of Adam was in optima forma παράβασις, transgression of a very special divine command. And precisely upon the transgression of this command the punishment of death had been placed. After God had given

Adam the command, "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shalt eat." He continued, "for in the day that you eat." He continued, "for in the day that you eat from it you shall surely die" (Gn 2:17). The announcement of the execution of the death sentence He introduced with the words, "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree about which I commanded you, saying, 'You shall not eat from it'" (Gn 3:17). Thus, the transgression of the positive command is presented as the actual cause of death. But not only were all the children of Adam in general placed under the power of death, but also the first generations of the human race. These first people had no positive command or law like Adam nor like Israel after Moses. Thus, they were not transgressors.

Concerning the reign of the terror of death in pre-Mosaic times "The book of the generations of Adam" (Gn 5) very expressly testifies. There, each of the biographies of the devout patriarchs of mankind closes with the significant, earnest "and he died", וַיָּמָוֶה . How is this fact to be explained? Not by the sins which these first generations of men had committed personally, since they did not have the characteristic of transgression. Thus, the only remaining assumption is that those sinners of the first period of the world became subject to death because of the one transgression of Adam. And thus the statement in vv.12 is proven. For, evidently, all men die in the same manner, like the first thousands and millions died. The general reign of death, which began in the days of Adam, settled itself on earth in the centuries before Moses and has remained and will remain through all times. This, as the example of the first generations of men prove, was causally established in the sin of the first man. This argumentation of the Apostle is so clear that it appears superfluous to follow up the intricate ways of those expositors who, from the sentence structure of vv.13-14, draw a proof for the universality of sin.

What the Apostle states here regarding death is not everything that the Scriptures teach regarding death and the relationship of death to sin. According to the Scriptures death is in general, the wages of sin. To that fact Paul also testifies Romans 6:23. There he admonishes Christians, who have and know the revealed Law, not to become again obedient to sin. He bases this admonition on the fact that with serving sin, with transgression, they would merit death. As eternal life is the underserved, free gift of God, so death is the deserved reward, ὁψώνια , or, what is the same, the deserved punishment of sin. And since death as the wages of sin applies generally, it also applies regarding the Gentiles. Even the sin of the Gentiles is not a real transgression of the Law because they do not have a positive Law, they are still answerable to God for their

actions. They have a substitute for the revealed Law in the law which is written in their hearts. This fact the Apostle proved in 2:14ff. And because they know the legal demands of God and deny the same with their evil, shameful works, they are therefore "worthy of death," ἄξιον θανάτου (1:32). "For all who have sinned without the Law will also perish without the Law" (2:12). Paul previously presented the death of Christ as a sacrificial death. However, the basis of the sacrifice, as we have shown above, lies the axiom: The soul that sins, it shall die." Yes, the Scriptures go a step farther and teach that already by nature, from our birth on, we are children of wrath because of original sin (Eph 2:3). All this the Apostle does not mention in our passage. But what he does say here does not contradict the above mentioned statements of the Scripture. Otherwise, Paul would contradict himself. Ro 5:12-14 deals especially with the beginning, with the sources of death, with the origin of this historical fact of the general reign of death on the earth. And, therefore, the one transgression of Adam, as the dogmaticians express themselves, is the primary cause (causa primaria), the real efficient cause (causa efficiens), the effecting cause of death for all men. Indeed, every sin, even if it is not a conscious transgression, is already stirring in a heart which is hostile to God and makes a man unworthy of the life which is given by God and, instead, worthy of death. But according to His wisdom (which we cannot fathom and should not investigate), it has pleased God to lay the death penalty on the transgression of a specific command; that is, the first transgression of the Law by the first man. He then accounted the transgression of Adam to all men and, for that reason, from the very beginning He has subjected the entire race of man to death, so that all men alike have been born into death. This death, which the one sin of Adam has brought into the world upon all men from the beginning on, since the first man's fall into sin, is and reigns in the world. God also uses this death for this purpose of punishing individual transgressions and the inborn sinfulness of the individual. Above, under 2:6ff., we have quoted that passage of our Confession which reads, "Scriptures call eternal life a reward, not that God is obligated to give eternal life for the sake of works, but after eternal life has been given otherwise for other reasons, that nevertheless our works and tribulations are thereby rewarded." Similarly, we can say here that with death (which for other reasons, namely, because of the one sin of Adam, has been inflicted upon the entire race of man), the evil works of all the individual children of Adam likewise shall be rewarded. Bengel fittingly remarks, as quoted by Philippi,

Indeed, the death of many is directly ascribed to the fall of one, v.15. Thus it is not denied that death is the reward for every sin, but it is shown that the first sin is the primary cause of death. This is

our destruction: a thief, who has committed a murder during a theft, is punished for the murder, but still does not escape punishment for the theft. The punishment for theft flows together with the punishment for murder, though it is not regarded equal to punishment for murder. Source: D. Joh. Alberti Bengelii GNOMON NOVI TESTAMENTI. Ed. Paul Steadel, Stuttgartiae 1915 Sumptibus J. F. Steinkopf. pp. 565-566.

[Sane unius lapsui mors multorum assignatur immediate. Sic non negatur, cujus vis peccati stipendium esse mortem, sed ostenditur, primariam mortis causam esse peccatum primum. Hoc nos peremit: sicut latro post homicidium furatus punitur ob homicidam, nec tamen impune furatus est, furti poena in poenam homicidii confuenti, sed ad homicidii poenam vix aestimata].

Finally, we must still consider the fact that death, even insofar as it is punishment for individual sins and for the sinfulness of the individual, has its final roots in the sin of Adam. Adam's sin was the foundation and cause because from that hour on Adam's nature was completely changed and disturbed and was entirely impure and corrupted. This natural corruption descended upon all the children of Adam and from the children of Adam came nothing but evil fruits and works. However, this is not mentioned in Ro 5:12ff.

To the name 'Αδάμ in v.14 there is added a relative clause, "who is a type of Him who was to come", ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος . "Type", τύπος , really a derivative of τύπτω , means, "impression from a blow, mark, sign" as "imprint of the nails", τύπος τῶν ἥλων (Jn 20:25); then, "picture or form" as "form of teaching", τύπος διδασχῆς (Ro 6:17); more particularly "example" as in most New Testament passages, such as 2 Th 3:9, "to offer ourselves as a model for you, that you might follow our example", ἑαυτοὺς τύπον δῶμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς (1 Th 1:7, Php 3:17, 1 Tm 4:12, Tt 2:7, 1 Pe 5:3); and finally, prophetic pattern, which we call a type, as in 1 Co 10:6-11 and our passage. Adam is a type "of Him who is to come", τοῦ μέλλοντος , the closest identification is, self-evidently, Christ. As in 1 Co 15:45 Christ is called "the last Adam", ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ "so here, from the standpoint of the first Adam, He is called "the coming Adam", ὁ μέλλων Ἀδάμ .

Many expositors, like Thöluck, Koellner, Philippi, Meyer, Weiss, and Luthardt, see these words as the apodosis, or at least a virtual apodosis or substitution for the apodosis, to the protasis which began in v.12 with the "justas", ὥσπερ . But the relative clause is neither grammatically nor actually suitable for this. It says nothing as to the extent that Adam is a type of Christ or of what similarity there is between Adam and Christ. He only observes that Adam is Christ's type. He only expresses the same thought which already lies in the ὥσπερ in v.12. Thus, after the protasis in v.12 is amplified through a demonstration of proof in vv. 13-14, he once again reminds

the readers that what has been said of Adam in vv.12-14 should introduce a corresponding statement concerning Christ. Certainly such a reminder would be improper and disturbing if the οὕτως , which corresponds to the ὥσπερ , would follow immediately. But that is certainly not the case.

Vv.15-17.

The Apostle continues with, "But the free gift is not like the transgression", οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα (v.15a) and "and the gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned", οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα (v.16a). These are the two principal statements which stand out in the sentence structure and are then proved. By means of the restrictive "but", ἀλλά , this is added to the preceding relative clause "who is a type of Him who was to come", ὃς ἐστὶ τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος , and, with that, to the comparison introduced with ὥσπερ in v.12.

The connection of thought follows. In what way the typical parallel between the first and the future Adam exists, the Apostle had still not given an expressed word. Yet, according to all that he had taught from 3:21 on concerning Christ, and especially in 5:5-11 in which he deduces the final "salvation", σωτηρία , from the previously prepared justification, every reader of this Letter can find the apodasis to the protasis which was introduced with ὥσπερ in v.12. As by one man's sin death has come upon all men, so by one Man's righteousness life has come for all men. That, in a few words, is the self-evident sense of the comparative statement intended by the Apostle. Righteousness and life are the two principal concepts of the prior doctrinal presentation. Salvation in Christ consists of these two points, and they return also in the section under discussion. Righteousness and life are the opposite of sin and death. Yes, through righteousness, sin is destroyed; through life, death is destroyed. First, a contrast exists between Adam, who brought sin and death into the world, and Christ, who brought righteousness and life into the world. Nevertheless, with the contrast there is at the same time, a similarity; that is, a typical parallel. In Ro 5:12ff. there are things compared with one another. They are, in themselves, opposite things (res contrariae), in which the contrasting relationship is not addressed. That which has been accomplished by the one and that which was accomplished by the other both extend from the one to the many, to all men. The comprehensive effect of what each has individually done and their individual influence upon the many is, evidently, the point of comparison (tertium comparationis). But this parallelism needs a restriction. The relation of the second Adam, even as it concerns the effects on the many is somewhat different from that of the first Adam. In the similarity there exists a difference. And this difference in the

relationship of the one to the many, the discrepancy in the parallel, the dissimile in simili, the Apostle calls to our attention in vv.15-17. Bengel:

Adam and Christ, though following contrary reasons, agree in the positive degree; in the comparative they differ. Paul first hints at the agreement in v.12-14, expressed in the protasis. Meanwhile it is left to be understood in the apodosis. Thereafter he describes the difference much more directly and expressly.

[Adamus et Christus, secundum rationes contrarias, conveniunt in positivo; differunt in comparativo. Convenientiam Paulus primum v.12-14 innuit, protasis expressa, apodosi tantisper ad subaudiendum reticta. Deinde differentiam multo magis directe et expresse describit.]

What is found concerning the first Adam is named by the Apostle in v.15 as παράπτωμα, that is "fall, misstep, or offense". As the preceding and following shows, the Apostle evidently means the same thing that he had mentioned in verse 14, "the offence of Adam", παράβασις Ἀδάμ. What is found concerning the second Adam he very generally designates first as "gift of grace", χάρισμα. And now he stresses that a difference exists between the two Adams. In spite of the typical relationship between Adam and Christ, there is a different circumstance in the χάρισμα and the παράπτωμα: "The free gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned", οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα (v.15a). That is proven in v.15b, :For if by the transgression of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many", εἰ γὰρ τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἢ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν.

Through the fall, or misstep, one of one, it has happened that the many have become subject to death. Meyer remarks very correctly, "In our passage one sees that Paul, in explaining the death of man, does not consider their individual sins as the efficient cause (causa efficiens) or even the means (medians). One adds to the matter by interpreting, 'The many sinned and found death, like the first Adam'," Instead of "all men" Paul here writes "the many", οἱ πολλοί, whereby he naturally means all men, in order to create the impression of a great multitude and to emphasize the contrast to the "one", εἰς more. It is a "vast number of men" (ingens hominum numerus) (Fritzsche) over which the fall of the one has brought death. And now, if through the fall of the one many have died, as is truly the case, then the "gift" χάρισμα, of the One has been extended over the many. This is the meaning of the Apostle: the χάρισμα, like the παράπτωμα, has in its effect passed over from the one to the many - that is the exact parallel. That makes Christ the Antitype of Adam.

The "much more", *πολλῷ μᾶλλον*, however, shows a difference in the parallel. When one compares the "offence", *παράπτωμα* and the "gift", *χάρισμα*, exactly with one another, then a plus is to be recorded on the side of the *χάρισμα* and its extent over the many. As usual, *πολλῷ μᾶλλον* here designates I see also 5: 9,10,17), "rather," in the sense of "much sooner" or "much more certainly". Thus it designates, as it has been called, "a logical plus" or "a plus of evidence and certainty." But this "logical" plus, as Lange correctly remarks, involves a "real" plus. Paul, here in v.15b, circumscribes the concept *χάρισμα* in such a manner that it is immediately apparent that *χάρισμα* surpasses the *παράπτωμα*. What he compares to the *παράπτωμα* in v.15b is "the grace of God", *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ*, the grace or gracious disposition which God has shown and the gift which exists in the grace of the one man Jesus Christ; that is, in the grace which Jesus Christ has shown. We combine the modifier "by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ", *ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, not "did abound", with *ἐπερίσσευσε*, but with "the gift", *ἡ δωρεά*, which needs such a supplement. Otherwise one would not know what kind of a gift is meant. The "grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ", *χάρις ἡ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* is the congruent correlate to "by the transgression of the one", *τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι*. But in the grace of the one Man Jesus Christ, the grace of God *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ*, is demonstrated. And the grace of God is an entirely different power. It is a much greater, stronger and efficacious power than the misstep of the one man. Therefore concerning the grace of God and the grace of Jesus Christ, it is not only said that it has "come upon" the many, but that it "has abounded" unto many. It has poured itself out richly, *ἐπερίσσευσε*, upon the many. Since it is God who, according to His strong righteousness and because of the misstep of one, has brought death upon the many, one can therefore define the difference or the "plus", as Meyer does, "God far rather permits His favor to rule than His severity," or to speak with Fritzsche, "God is much kinder than He is cruel." And because it is true that the boundless grace of God in Christ lies on the balance scale, then all who suffer under the effect of the sin of Adam can and should be much more certain that they also have a share in the *χάρισμα* of Christ. Similarly, Hofmann explains our passage, "According to the way that this man could show grace to mankind as God, so it is in this case that the effect is twofold grace, divine and human; divine, which is unlimited in its giving, and human, which as such is capable of passing over from the giver to men who are like himself. Such twofold grace, of the originator and of the Mediator, is grace which gives and grace in which the gift consists; it is the effective element. What a contrast to the transgression of the one! In how much greater measure was the effective element

efficacious! Philippi writes, "How should the salutary effect of an act of God not be much more certain than the condemning effect of an act of man."

The passage in vv.16-17, which is introduced with "And the gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned", καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα, evidently constitutes a second difference in the parallel. This difference will be self-apparent when we have first examined the individual expressions and then made clear the interrelationship of the individual parts of the sentence. The clause οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα (v.16a), corresponds in form and content to the introduction of verse 15, "the free gift is not like the transgression", οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα. Still, it is not simply a recapitulation of verse 15 - the conjunction καὶ speaks against this. The clause οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα is more general in content and states only that a general difference exists between Adam and Christ and between the "offense", παράπτωμα and the "grace", χάρισμα in spite of the typical relationship. That is proven in v.15b by the fact that a special difference, a plus on the side of the χάρισμα, is demonstrated. And now the principal clause in v.16a introduces a second special difference. Meyer, Weiss, Godet, Hofmann and Luthardt connect "not like that which came through the one who sinned", οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος very closely with "the gift:", τὸ δῶρημα, and explain, "It is not so with the gift, as if it would have been caused δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος." Rather, that would have been caused by the many sins. But the thought that the gift had been occasioned by the sin lies entirely outside of the context. In the entire connection (5:12-21) sin appears only as a cause of punishment by death. Therefore, this interpretation also contradicts the entire development of the sentence structure in vv.16-17. The antitype against the type is in every part of the sentence (v.15a, v.15b, v.16b, v.17). So verse 16a is characterized with ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος on the one side as the type and οὐ τὸ δῶρημα on the other side as the Antitype. On the side of the type is applied, "through the one who sinned", δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος. Fritzsche supplements, "the offence", τὸ παράπτωμα; Bengel, "the judgement", τὸ κρίμα; Hodge, "the condemnation", τὸ κατάκριμα. These are too specific - the expression in general needs no real grammatical supplement. The Greek favors shortened comparisons. In speaking of a second difference, the Apostle initially presents only the characteristic key word. His meaning, as the context shows, is this, "On the typical side, what concerns Adam, the παράπτωμα, is that which has happened, has come over the many, and has been occasioned by the one who has sinned". On the one side stands the "the one who sinned", εἰς ἀμαρτήσας, upon whom everything depends. What concerns the other side, the antitype, the "gift", δῶρημα, is to be first

noted only in that it is not the same as the type. In other words, the characteristic $\delta\upsilon'$ ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος in the type has no exact correlate in the antitype.

"For on the one hand the judgement arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification." Thus, verse 16b continues. In reference to the type, the παράπτωμα, it means this, τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἐνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα. The judgment which God has placed upon mankind has become condemnation, a judgment of damnation. Evidently with "condemnation", κατάκριμα, the Apostle is thinking of the death of which he had spoken in v.15b and the general reign of death, of which he will speak in v.17a. Still, "condemnation", κατάκριμα and "death", θάνατος are not completely identical concepts. Death and its reign is the execution of the divine judgment of punishment; the later is the carrying out of the former. The emphasis, however, lies upon the "arose from one", ἐξ ἐνός. Because of the one, men have been sentenced to death. The nature of the matter makes it necessary that we more exactly determine "arose from one", ἐξ ἐνός, as that "the one" was the cause of the "condemnation", κατάκριμα. The one who sinned, with his sin or transgression, occasioned and caused the judgment of death which was pronounced upon man in general (in genere). The sin of Adam was, according to v.12, the sin of all men and was imputed to all men as sin.

What does it mean, on the other hand, for the antitype? There, it applies, "but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification", τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα. The free gift of grace has resulted in "justification", δικαίωμα, for the offenses of many. Δικαίωμα can almost be translated by "judgment of justification". But this translation cannot be justified linguistically. The idiom δικαίωμα, to speak with Hofmann, may mean either, "Justice as an expressed demand" or "Justice as a fact that has become true". We can either say "legal statute", as much as a demand of the Law and commandment, or we can say the "facts of the case of justification", as much as fulfillment of the Law and righteousness. The first meaning the word

is found, for example, in Luke 1:6; Ro 1:32; 2:26; 8:4. The latter is found in Re 19:8, "The righteous acts of the saints", τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων ; 15:4, "Thy righteous acts have been revealed", τὰ δικαιώματα σου ἐφανερώθησαν. .

Likewise also in Pr 8:20, where the expression τρίβου δικαλώματος and ὁδοὺ δικαιοσύνης interchange with one another; and evidently also in Ro 5:18, where it appears as a synonym of "obedience", ὑπακοή in v.19. Δικαίωμα has this latter meaning also in our passage. Luther has correctly translated it with "justification". In the following verse, δικαιοσύνη is substituted. Self-evidently, however, "justification", is meant in the sense of imputed justification or righteousness. (justitia imputata). Thus, with this interpretation the contrast between "condemnation", κατάκριμα , and δικαίωμα is also preserved. The gift of grace has redounded to the fact that mankind, condemned because of the sin of Adam, are now righteous and have God's judgment in their favor. It is that which God has given to man by grace - the righteousness which avails before Him. The Apostle could have expressed himself as in the following verse, that the gift consists of the righteousness. But he chooses the expression "resulting in justification", εἰς δικαίωμα , because here he would contrast ἐκ and εἰς with one another. Here the emphasis rests upon the modifying phrase, which is introduced with ἐκ. The ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων is stressed and means, "offenses of many". The contrast to the preceding double "one", ἐνός , demands that "many", πολλῶν designate the masculine. A similar combination is ἐκ πολλῶν καρδῶν (Luke 2:35). The preposition ἐκ designates here merely the direction "from whence". The meaning is, "From the offenses of many"; this was the former status quo which has been changed to the state of righteousness. Taking ἐκ in our passage as causative and directing the words ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων to the fact that the many transgressions have either caused or called forth the δικαίωμα "as a necessity", results in a thought which, as already remarked above, lies far outside of the entire context. Δικαίωμα from the offenses of many, however, says nothing else than that the many, that is, all men are justified and

absolved of all their transgressions. The righteousness which avails before God, as we have seen, is, to the Apostle, identical with the forgiveness of sins. And thus men are forgiven not only the transgression of the one, which had been accounted to them all, but are also forgiven all their individual sins and transgressions. As Philippi correctly remarks, Christ has not only healed the injury which Adam caused, but also that which we ourselves have added to it.

A conclusion follows in v.17 which is similar to that in v.15, For if by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ", εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσεύαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Here, as in v.15b, the antitype is judged by the type. In the protasis we follow the lectio recepta τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι, which is more plausible than the variants ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι or ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ παραπτώματι. This is the type: By the one, by his fall or misstep, death now exercises lordship on earth and all the children of Adam from the beginning are subject to death. However, if that is so, as it is truly the case, then more surely πολλῷ μᾶλλον will follow that of which the apodasis speaks. Then we shall even more surely reign in life. The reign of life is correlated as the antitype to the reign of death. The Apostle has in mind from the beginning of the statement of comparison, the concept "life". In the protasis which is introduced with ὥστε, he called special attention to the universal dispersion of death.

The reign of life is a different kind of reign than that of death. Death is the βασιλεύς, the tyrant, who reduces men to servitude and lets them feel the terror of his power. But the men who stand in life are the rulers οἱ βασιλεύοντες. The life out of death, the eternal life, is freedom. It excludes all force; yes it raises up to sovereignty those who attain it. Elsewhere, the Scriptures describe the future "salvation", σωτηρία, as a ruling, reigning and governing

receive in this life the gift that consists in righteousness shall in the future reign in life. The reign of life has, as its foundation, the righteousness which avails before God, even as the reign of death has as its foundation "condemnation", κατάρημα . In the presentation of the theme of the Epistle (1:16-17). the "righteousness of God", δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ , appears as the preliminary condition of the future "salvation", σωτηρία . And in 5:5-11 the conclusion was drawn from the justification upon the life to come. Man must first become righteous before God; he must be freed from the guilt of sin before he can attain eternal life. That is the gift of God, τὸ χάρισμα, τὸ δῶρημα : first righteousness, then eternal life.

We translate οἱ λαμβάνοντες with Luther and most of exegetes, "those who receive"; not, "those who accept". For life does not depend on the act of taking, but on the gift of righteousness and on the fact that the individual partakes of this gift himself, receiving it as his own. That takes place by faith. Thus, the expression λαμβάνειν , even if taken as a "receiving", certainly involves the concept of faith. Still faith comes into consideration, not insofar as it acts and accepts the gift, but insofar as it enters into personal possession of the gift which it applies to itself. The believers are the only ones who shall de facto reign in life in the future. Indeed, "righteousness", δικαίωμα , has come for the many - for all men. And, as a result, heaven is open to all. Salvation has been prepared for all men. Nevertheless, only he who appropriates the gift of righteousness in faith, and thereby receives it as his own, really receives life. Those who reject and despise this "righteousness", δικαίωμα , go away empty and destroy for themselves the benefits and fruits of the same, i.e. eternal salvation.

The object of λαμβάνειν , however, now appears not only as simply the gift of righteousness, but also "the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness", τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης . The emphasis is on this expanded designation of the object. In the gift of righteousness, the gracious disposition of God proves and confirms itself. And it is the fulness of

grace and righteousness which we receive; or, as we who stand in faith now say, have received. Boundless grace and righteousness have been imparted to us. With this designation of the gift we come closest to the Greek expression περισσεύαν . Wherein this περισσεύα of grace and righteousness consists is not doubtful in light of that which is said in v.16. Not only the sin of Adam, but also our trespasses as well as those of all men have been forgiven, even though they were many and so great and severe. To the expression in 17b, which characterizes the antitype, is further added the modifies "through the One, Jesus Christ", διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . Through the One, Jesus Chrstit, shall those who in this life receive the gift of righteousness reign in life in the future. Chrstit has merited and prepared this boundless righteousness for them. The precious name of Jesus Christ, to whom we owe the fulness of all good, is emphatically placed at the end of the sentence; but the one from whom men have received such an evil inheritance remains unnamed.

After we have inspected the individual parts of this rich conditional sentence (v.17), we return again to the starting point of the explanation. By means of πολλῷ μᾶλλον , the apododis is joined to the protasis. What the Apostle here calls special attention to and emphasizes is this: those who receive the fulness of grace and righteousness shall, in the future, reign through Christ in life. This is much more certain than what was previously said about death reigning by one. The reign of life is much more certain than the reign of death; namely, for the reason that it rests on the most firm and certain foundation, i.e. the boundless grace and gift of righteousness or the forgiveness of all sins and transgressions which were ever or shall ever be committed in the world until the end of days. At the foundation of the logical "plus", which is found on the side of the χάρισμα , there also lies an "material" plus.

The inter-relationship of the three statements in v.16a, v.16b, and v.17 still needs to be discussed. The two statements in v.16b and v.17, which are introduced with γάρ , are evidently of similar content, with the latter supplementing the

former. In v.16b the discussion is only concerning the "condemnation", κατὰκριμα and the "righteousness", δικαίωμα, but in v.17 the discussion also concerns the fruit and effect of both - of death and life. Thus it is appropriate to the content of both statements that we coordinate them and look upon them as joint proof for v.16a. Also, this is much more natural than to subordinate them to one another, and perhaps, with Philippi, Meyer, Weiss, and others, take it that v.16a is proven by v.16b and then v.16b again by v.17, or, with Hofmann, that v.17 proves that v.16a is proven by v.16b. The power of proof of the individual sentence (vv.16b-17) according to its content, lies in the words "from many transgressions", ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων, and τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης. The offenses of many have come to "righteousness", δικαίωμα, that is, abundant grace, which more certainly brings with it the reign of life than the offense of one brought the reign of death. With that, the principal clause in v.16a is proven; namely, the statement that there is a different state of affairs with the "gift", δώρημα, than with the type, insofar as for this the "through the one who sinned", δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος, is characteristic. The entire sentence structure in vv.16-17 is the same time, a second proof for the principal clause in v.15a, the general statement that the "transgression", παράπτωμα, and the "free gift", χάρισμα, differ from one another in general.

Herewith, the second point of difference in the typical parallel between Adam and Christ, which Paul stresses in vv.16-17, is clarified. Hofmann sees the difference in the "righteousness", δικαίωμα and the gift of righteousness, to which there is no correspondence between the one's evil deed and the consequent rule of death. But, in the latter the "condemnation", κατὰκριμα, corresponds to the "righteousness", δικαίωμα. In v.17, Godet lays the emphasis on "those who receive", οἱ λαμβάνοντες and takes λαμβάνειν as a "moral condition" on which the reign of life depends. He holds that such a condition is found only on the side of salvation, and not on the other side. But, as we have shown above the stress is on the object of λαμβάνειν. The subjective conduct of man would

be a very weak and insecure basis for the certainty of life. Philippi, Meyer, Weiss and most of the expositors acknowledge that the Apostle in v.16 calls special attention to the discrepancy between *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος* and *ἐξ ἑνός* on the one side and *ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων* on the other. But with the resulting in justification", *ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα* , the "the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness", *περισσεῖα τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης* , in v.17 is to be identified. We briefly recall once again, the result of the exegesis given above. In v.15, "the many", *οἱ πολλοί* , and "to the many", *εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς* , were stressed. In vv.16-17 the emphasis is on the fivefold *ἑνός* , resp. *δι' ἑνός*, *ἐξ ἑνός*. . The "through the one", *δι' ἑνός* , applies to both sides. By the one who had sinned, the judgment of condemnation and death has come upon all men; by the one, Jesus Christ, righteousness and life have been earned for the children of Adam who had been condemned to death. But in this parallel, exactly with regard to the "through one", *δι' ἑνός* , there is a difference and a plus to be noted on the side of the "free gift", *χάρισμα* . Christ has not only repaired the harm of Adam, but also has justified the many of all their individual transgressions. Therefore, those who receive the boundless grace and gift of righteousness, more certainly than the sin of the one had caused death for the human race, shall reign in life.

And when we take both of the two differences which are mentioned in v.15b and in vv.16-17, then the result is that a discrepancy is inherent in the entire parallel between Adam and Christ. Throughout, there is a plus on the side of the gift of Christ! The complete parallel states: what both Adam and Christ have done or brought about has passed over from the one to the many. But, regard both to the *εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς* and to the *δι' ἑνός* or *ἐξ ἑνός* , the gift of Christ far surpasses the fall of Adam. The grace of Christ and the grace of God is stronger and more efficacious. It comes upon the many in a greater way than the *παράπτωμα* of Adam. The gift of righteousness mediated by Christ

covers far more sins than just the one sin of Adam. And, therefore, life is much more certain than death.

How comforting that is for poor, sinful, children of Adam! Yes, what fullness of comfort lies hidden in this sharp dialectic deduction of the Apostle! We are all children of death. We are, because of the sin of Adam, born under the reign of death. Our entire life strives toward death. Over the richest power of life hovers the breath of death. Nothing is more certain for us than the fact that we must die. But one thing is still more certain; namely, that we shall live. Life, the life won from death, which we do not see or feel, is more certain for us than the death which we have daily before our eyes and, as it were, can grasp with our hands. For the great, rich, and gracious God, on whose grace life depends, permits His grace to rule and work more than His strict righteousness, which had sentenced all men to death because of the sin of Adam. And by grace, God has already through Christ forgiven us not only the sin of Adam, but all of our own numberless transgressions, great and small, known and unknown. There no longer stands anything, absolutely nothing, between us and God. Therefore, how can the gift of God, eternal life, fail us? Yes, there is only one thing necessary: that we die and lay aside this mortal tabernacle of the body and thereby pay the last tribute to the sin of Adam. Then Adam, sin and death will lie far, far behind and under us. We will enter into life through death and shall eternally reign and triumph in life with Christ.

Vv.18-19.

The sentence in v.18a evidently corresponds in form and content to the statement in v.12. And so the best interpretation is that the Apostle, after interrupting the construction, with the words, "so then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men", Ἀρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, again takes up the protasis of the comparative statement in v.12 and with "even so thorough one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men", οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν^{ζωῆς}, adds the apodosis. After Paul established the first

half of the comparison in v.12 with vv.13-14, and then in vv.15-17 shown the difference in the similarity between Adam and Christ, he now comes to the point to carry out in clear words (expressis verbis) from every angle the parallel which lays at the base of his description of the difference.

The sentence in v.18 no more needs a real grammatical supplement than the similar sentence in v.16b. "In order to save himself and the reader all unnecessary formalities of expression, the Apostle intentionally mentions both times only "how" and a twofold source, of the person and the matter" (Hofmann). By the fall, the offense of one (Adam), "condemnation", κατάκριμα, has come to all men; namely, according to the connection of "condemnation of death", κατάκριμα τοῦ θανάτου it has happened that all men are sentenced to death. On the other hand, there is the corresponding "righteousness", δικαίωμα, of One (Christ) that has come to the "righteousness of life", δικαίωσις ζωῆς. Δικαίωμα here, as in v.16, designates the facts of the case of being righteous; nevertheless not, as in v.16, the imputed righteousness (justitia imputata), but, since Christ is here the subject, it designates the righteousness which Christ has proven. Even Philippi, who took it in v.16 as a judgment of justification, here translates it with "fulfillment of the Law". And so do most of the expositors.

It stands in contrast to the "transgression", παράπτωμα, of Adam and is synonymous with "obedience", ὑπακοή, in v.19. The Apostle had previously mentioned Christ's death and blood as the foundation for justification. Nevertheless, the death of Christ was not only a fate of punishment which befell Christ, but it was at the same time Christ's own act. Christ has given Himself for us. The atoning power of the bloody sacrifice of Christ rests also in the fact that it was a willing sacrifice. Only a willing sacrifice is pleasing to God. Christ was obedient even to the death on the cross. He precisely proved His obedience in dying on the cross.

But the content of the "righteousness", δικαίωμα, of Christ goes still further. It includes the entire obedience which Christ rendered to God in life,

suffering and death, the obedientia activa et passiva. Christ fulfilled all the righteousness of the Law, satisfying not only the punishment but also the demanding divine righteousness. Christ's entire conduct on earth, including His death, was undividedly proper. And by this righteousness it has now come to the "justification of life", δικαίωμα ζωῆς , for all people. The Apostle with δικαιοῦν and δικαιοσύνη , elsewhere often designates more generally the judgment of God over sinful mankind; that is, that God considers and looks upon the sinner as devout and righteous, justam reputat, and that the sinner appears as justified before God. In many places, however, he takes the expression δικαιοῦν very strictly as the formal judicial pronouncement of God, as "declare righteous", justum pronunciare (4:5; 8:33). And this is the strict meaning of the noun δικαίωσις in both of the passages where it occurs in the New Testament, 4:25 and our passage. Christ's righteousness has brought it to pass that all men are justified and declared righteous and that, thereby, life is awarded them.

The two facts manifested in v.18 are grounded in two other closely connected facts. "For as through one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so by the obedience of the One the many will be made righteous" (v.19). By the disobedience of the one man, Adam, many, that is, all men, were presented as sinners; that alone is signified by "were made, rendered", κατεστάθησαν , nothing else. Not peccatores facti, but peccatores constituti sunt. They have come to stand before God as sinners. That means in other words: The disobedience of Adam has been imputed to the many. And therefore, because in this manner they have all come to stand before God as disobedient, they have come into "condemnation", κατάκριμα ; they have been sentenced to death. This is the same train of thought which we found in v.12 where it said that, as a result of the sin of Adam, death passed upon all men because they all sinned in and with Adam. To this corresponds the fact that by the obedience of One, many will be presented as righteous. The future "will be made", κατασταθήσονται , refers not to the future, as if to designate something which would begin only on the Last Day (Meyer, Godet, Luthardt) or something which would continue on and on in this time (Weiss, Philippi). For

the καθίστασθαι δίκαιου is evidently established and given immediately, just as the δικαίωσις ζωῆς is immediately given with the δικαίωμα of Christ. With Hofmann and others, we would rather take the future as the logical future or, as it has also been called, the future of logical certainty. Here it designates the logical result of that which was previously said concerning Adam and his disobedience. If by the disobedience of one the many have come to stand before God as sinners, then certainly the other, that by the obedience of One the many shall come to stand before God as righteous, shall also be true. And this falls, historically, in the past. By the obedience of Christ the many have come to stand before God as righteous. The obedience of Christ has been imputed to them, and therefore they are declared rightwous. Life has been granted to them. The καθίστασθαι δίκαιου is the middle member between the δικαίωμα of Christ and the δικαίωσις of the many, as the καθίστασθαι ἀμαρτολόγ is the middle member between the disobedience of Adam and the condemnation of the many.

In our text (vv.18-19), the righteousness which avails before God is reduced into its individual phases, while elsewhere the Apostle speaks of it more summarily, saying that we are justified or have been justified by Christ before God and that God considers us as righteous for Christ's sake. And in every detail, the facts of the matter concerning Christ correspond to the facts of the matter concerning Adam. Adam had sinned, transgressed, and been disobedient. This disobedience of Adam has been imputed to all men. And, therefore, all men have been sentenced to death. That is the type. The Antitype is that Christ fulfilled all righteousness and was obedient. Christ's righteousness and obedience have been imputed to all men. And therefore, the righteousness of life has been achieved for all mankind. Even in this parallel, though, one dare not overlook the previously presented dissimile in simile; namely, that God, who is abounding in grace, grants the good deed (bene factum) and benefits (beneficium) of Christ more than the evil deed (male factum) of Adam and its fatal results to the many. By Christ's obedience and righteousness, not only the disobedience of Adam has been covered, but also the disobedience and the unrighteousness of many.

The passage treated above, vv.18-19, is the locus classicus for the doctrine of the general or, so-called, objective justification. Here the Apostle teaches and testifies expressis verbis, that the righteousness of life has been made available for all mankind and that the many have been placed before God as righteous, as already stated in v.16: that from the offenses of many there has come "righteousness:, δικαίωμα, and that all men have been justified and absolved of all their transgressions. Most modern expositors, and some ancient ones, refer these apostolic words to the believers; that is, to all those who through

faith belong to Christ. They make the comment that such a restriction is self-understood. But that is pure arbitrariness. When one permits himself to apply such glosses to the text, all trustworthiness of exegesis disappears. In these three sentences, faith is not mentioned with a single syllable.

Philippi refers to 1 Cor 15:22, Ro 11:32, 2 Cor 5:15, Ga 3:22, and 2 Th 3:2 for "an entirely equal limited use of πάντες ." Similarly Hodge. Still, these passages do not prove what they are supposed to prove. In 1 Cor 15:22 we read, "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive", ὡς περ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται. We certainly cannot agree with Meyer, who here understands also the second πάντες as all men and finds the general resurrection of the dead taught. For the Apostle speaks in the entire context from 1 Cor 15:12ff only of the resurrection of those who have fallen asleep in Christ. Likewise it would be very incorrect if one would change the πάντες before "shall be made alive", ζωοποιηθήσονται , in v.22 without any additional explanation into "the believers", οἱ πιστεύοντες , or take it generally in a "restricted" sense. Πάντες signifies "all"; omnes, nemine excepto (Fritzsche), and nothing further. But, indeed, it does not always designate all the members of the human race. It can also mean, according to it's context, all the individuals who belong to a designated class of people. And so in 1 Cor 15:22, the discussion is about the men who shall in the future be raised to eternal life. The meaning of the Apostle is this - that as in Adam and by Adam all men die, so also in Christ and by Christ shall all be made alive who have become partakers of the resurrection of life.

A similar occurrence is found in Ro 5:12ff., he speaks of the effect which from the first Adam, and then from the second Adam, passes upon the entire human race. And there he uses also not only the expression "all", πάντες , but intentionally writes "all man", πάντες ἄνθρωποι (vv.12,18). As Meyer and Hofmann also acknowledge, this can mean nothing else than all men without exception or all men without distinction. The other three passages mentioned by Philippi are: "and He died for all: (2 Cor 5:15); "But the Scripture has shut up all men under sin" (Ga 3:22); "for not all have faith" (2 Th 3:2). In each, τὰ πάντα apparently applies to all men in common. Philippi, Weiss and others, contrary to our solely grammatically correct interpretation of the words, "there resulted justification of life to all men", εἰς πάντες ἄνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς , further object that the Apostle would hereby teach "the general restoration". But because this teaching contradicts the prior Scriptural doctrine, it proves only how little these expositors have troubled themselves to do justice to the reading of the biblical text and to the thought and the thought-connection of the

Apostle. Yes, certainly, if Paul had written "there resulted, to all men, life", εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς ζωὴν , then he would teach that all men shall finally be saved. But he has not written thus; rather, he wrote, εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς . Thereby, he has stated that by Christ's righteousness and obedience a judgment of justification for all men is established, by which life is awarded to them and by which they have gained a right and expectancy of salvation. On the other hand, he shows and teaches in the same context, v.17, that the believers, "those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness", οἱ τὴν περισσεύαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες, shall in the future actually reign in life. Thus, all those who accept the gift of righteousness in faith and personally become partakers of it, or, similarly, all those who apply to themselves and make use of the judgment of justification that has been pronounced over the whole sinful world and proclaimed in the Gospel, shall finally actually be saved. Consequently, what Paul teaches in Rom. 5:16-19 agrees very well with the other doctrines of Scripture.

Moreover, he brings out this same truth in other passages of his Letter also, but with other words. We have previously shown that to him justification is identical with the forgiveness of sins. And thus he writes, for example, in 2 Cor 5:19, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not counting their trespasses against them:", μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν . Thus, in Christ God has already forgiven the whole world all their sins. The entire Pauline doctrine of justification, as well as all of the comfort of justification. Thus it is completely clear and evident that justification is totally independent of the conduct of man. And in this alone can the individual be entirely certain of his justification. It is a compelling conclusion that, if God has already justified all men in Christ and has forgiven them their sins, then I also have in Christ a gracious God and the forgiveness of all my sins. Moreover, the entire preceding presentation of the Apostle's doctrine regarding the "righteousness of God", δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ , which is presented by Christ and offered as a ready gift to man in the Gospel, implies just this: that the judgment of God, designated by the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ , concerns all men in general.

Let us once more briefly review the long periodical sentence which comes to an end in v.19. What the Apostle makes sharply prominent in this large and grandiose parallel between Adam and Christ is that both death and life depend on one man. We must die and be condemned because of another's guilt and we receive life and salvation because of another's righteousness. Certainly, this is a provoking article for the human reason and for the pride of natural man. All attempts which men have made to diminish this offense or to make this revealed truth plausible to human reason, as when one takes the first and second Adam as

men of certain classes and what the one or the other has done as acts of different classes, do not relieve but only increase the difficulty. No, it is necessary here simply to believe the Scripture and to adore the wonderful, incomprehensible wisdom of God, which condemns and saves man in the manner here described. Luther emphasized this when he expounded the related statement in American edition, Luther's Works, Vol. 28. 1 Cor 15:22. p. 115:

"It is a ridiculous message that St. Paul conveys here, telling us where both death and eternal life originate. To clever reason and worldly wisdom it seems to be a great strong lie that the entire human race must die for the guilt of another, of one single man. It seems too unfair and too absurd that God should treat this matter so strangely and take this silly position in His judgment. Because Adam bit into an apple, he is supposed to have effected that all men are doomed to die to the end of the world. But what is our position in this matter? That death befalls us we can all see clearly. But that this is due to one minor sin sounds too odd. When we explain this with words and compare the two, this does appear disproportionate.

For at this time Adam had, after all, not committed murder or adultery, he had not stolen or robbed anyone, he had not blasphemed God or committed any similar sins, wicked and horrible sins such as abound in the world today. All he did was to bite into an apple, persuaded to do this and deceived by the devil through his wife. Reason asks whether so much importance had to be attached to that one apple that the whole world had to pay for it and that so many fine, excellent, and wise people, indeed, God's Son Himself, together with all the prophets, fathers, and saints, had to die. Yes, if nothing more than death were involved here, as the world and wise people say, who console themselves over against death with the assumption that it ends all misfortune! If some better fate should await them after death, as they hope, they are willing to accept it too. Still they cannot conclude that with any degree of certainty: and of the resurrection they know nothing whatsoever. But the thought that we all deserve eternal punishment and damnation and suffering in hell because of the sin of someone else, and all of that by reason of just one sin - that is still harder to accept. For this judgment on the part of such an exalted Majesty, which is the highest Wisdom and Goodness, seems too unfair, and the action too merciless.

And again it sounds so absurd and so false to the world, yes, much more incredible, when Paul declares here that in one Man all men shall rise again; that both death and life rest with and depend on one man; that the whole world is unable to do anything in this matter; that no man's power or might, no saint's life, virtue, and work, are adequate reason for rising from the dead; that this is absolutely beyond the ability and the merit of every other human being and is centered solely in one single Man, who was unknown to the world and despised by it, who, moreover, died a most shameful and miserable death. To Him all the world is to accord honor, and He is to be regarded as the One by whom we all rise again. No holy monk, Carthusian, yes no prophet, apostle, or martyr, can contribute anything toward this or merit it with all his doings. This appears preposterous as we ponder it. It often appeared strange and odd to me myself. It is surely hard to convince the heart of this article. When I behold a corpse carried out and buried, it is hard to go my way and believe and think that we will some day rise together. How so, or by what power? Not by myself or by virtue of any merit on earth,

but by this one Christ. And that is indeed certain, far more certain than the fact that I will be buried and see someone else buried, which I know with certainty and behold with my eyes. Therefore this is a sermon for Christians and an article of faith...

Page 117. However, it pleased God to adopt that plan. He wants to make a fool of the world and of the wise, carrying out His work so that no one can comprehend it.

For if He did what you and I can understand and sketch out for Him, what honor would He derive from that? Or what sort of a God would He be who let us instruct Him, or who would be directed by us and work according to our wisdom? But as it is, He works in a manner in which His wisdom remains profounder than ours; we have to surrender to it and desist from criticizing. We must say: 'According to my wisdom this does not seem good; however, since You say it, it is just and good.' Anyone who will not do that but instead places his own wisdom before and above God's and judges Him accordingly, let him beware what he is doing. We, however, will confine our wisdom to things here below and apply it to cows and horses, trees, houses, fields, etc. In this area you may be smart and judge and rule as you will, and you may stick to your opinion. But we must not interfere with His wisdom and rule. That is too high and far removed for us, since we are under Him and He is over us as our Creator and Lord. Therefore we must give ear to Him and believe what He says, so that His honor remains unsullied and His grace and mercy alone prevail, without any glory or merit of ours" (LW 28, p.115).

And not only that death and life descend from one man, from one's guilt and from the other's merit, but also that which is introduced in Ro5:12ff. is a middle member: another's guilt is accounted to us as our own guilt and another's righteousness is accounted to us as our own righteousness. This belongs to the wonderful, inscrutable wisdom of God. The Church praises and acknowledges this divine wisdom, which is foolishness to the world, as their faith.

From the one side, light falls into darkness. God's wisdom and providence, "which is too high and distant for us," serves for the comfort and salvation of the poor sinners who groan and languish under the curse of Adam. Yes, certainly, if the Apostle would speak merely of Adam and the fatal result of his sin, then we could hardly find rest in this teaching. Then we would have to turn with shuddering and terror from the crushing truth. But what he says about Adam is for him only a foil or a basis in introducing what he wants to state concerning the second Adam. To be sure, he places before our eyes the abyss of the corruption of Adam. But he turns our vision immediately from the type to the Antitype and shows us the depth of unending, boundless divine mercy. And only for this purpose does he permit us to look into the depth of human corruption: that we might correctly measure the depth and height of divine grace. The comparison between Adam and Christ teaches and enjoins us to consider and conclude that, if because of another's guilt God has given us over into death and condemnation, then certainly He shall apply the same rule, according to which He

ascribe to us another's righteousness, the full obedience of Christ, and place it to our credit. And that is the only way in which humanity, since the fall of Adam, can stand before God and be saved. We, who are empty and void of all righteousness and can offer only misdeeds, transgressions and sin as our own possession and performance, envelop ourselves in an alien righteousness; namely, in Christ's blood and righteousness. Yes, as little as we first draw upon ourselves the condemnation by free decision, "the condemnation of death", τὸ κατ'ἀρχὴν τοῦ θανάτου, in that the entire human race from the beginning has been subjected to the power of death because of the sin of Adam, just as little do we merit and bring about through our own conduct God's gracious recognition the "justification of life", δικαίωσις ζωῆς. Rather, this is guaranteed to us from the beginning and consists simply and only of the "the righteousness of Christ outside of us and for us (justitia Christi extra nos, pro nobis)".

The gain which our passage (Ro 5:12-19) brings to our Christian knowledge, can also be reckoned finally as the correct Christian contemplation of history. Here, before our eyes, the history of mankind, from the fall of Adam until the final end, is pictured with grandiose strokes. Perhaps, with the exception of several limits, we can here make our own what Luthardt writes, "This story is a paradox, contrary in itself. On the one side are sin and death, wherein the judgment of God reveals and fulfills itself. On the other side we have righteousness and life, wherein God's judgment of justification reveals and fulfills itself. Thus, the reality is not simple or harmoniously developed, as the pantheistic thinker conceives it by failint to recognize the meaning of sin. It is a paradox - there is not only a simple subject but a two-fold subject. On the one side, there might be much good (that means, apparent good) - but the determining element remains sin and death. On the other side, there might not be a lack of sin and its results - but the determining factor remains righteousness and life. None the less, the result is that the whole is valid before the parts. The individual part does not creat, but rather enters into, the scope of the validity of the whole. There is sin, judgment and death from the beginning through the determining origin. The individual person is borne into the relationship of this community. Here is obedience and the righteousness of Christ, and their result is the judgment of justification of God. With that judgment the power and the kingdom of life is presented objectively. The individual only enters into the community of this accomplished salvation, to which he contributes nothing himself, but with which he concerns himself only by participation and appropriation."

Vv. 20-21.

The Apostle has spoken of two economies: the economy of sin and death, and the economy of righteousness and life. But there is also an economy of the Law.

What is this economy? What is the relationship of the Law to the other two economies? Paul first calls attention to the fact that the Law entered in with a subordinate meaning to the other two economies. And secondly, Paul points out that the Law does not help man in anyway towards righteousness and life, as some pharisaically-minded Jewish Christians might think. It is subservient to the first economy in that it has entered in on the side so that "the transgression might increase", ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα . "The transgression", τὸ παράπτωμα , can only be meant in that sense which the reader must understand according to v.15ff.; that is, the offense of Adam. This corrupting evil, which was present in the world as the beginning of sin and as the source of the common death, should be increased; that means, it is to have growth in always increasing "transgressions", παραπτώμασι . With the increase of the "transgression", παράπτωμα , sin has increased itself. The more general concept is ἡ ἀμαρτία . On this point, the increase of sin by the Law, Paul expresses himself in greater detail later (Ro 7:7ff.).

But where sin has abounded, the Apostle continues, grace has become superabundant, profuse, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν , supra modum abundavit. We understand οὐ not temporally, but, as usual, locally. We do not restrict this expression to the sphere of the people of Israel, but take the statement very generally, in the sense that where the first is the case, the second is also. If the one has taken place, then the other has also happened. If sin has increased, then grace has much more increased. Yes, grace has even surpassed the sin which was increased by the Law. And thus, through the entering in of the Law, the blessed goal of grace has not been made more remote. Therefore, as sin reigned in death, so also grace should reign by righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. The Law changes nothing in the status quo, which Paul had previously brought forth in the parallel between the first and the second Adam, to which he now points to again briefly. He said previously that death reigned by the "transgression", παράπτωμα , of the one (v.15), so now he says (v.21) that sin reigned in and with death, ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ . The reign of sin had shown and fulfilled itself in the general reign of death, in that even the reign of death was occasioned by sin, namely the παράπτωμα of Adam. This reign of sin unto death has given way, however, to the reign of grace. It is grace which now reigns regally to eternal life, which is the ultimate purpose (finis ultimus) of grace; specifically, by the righteousness which it procures for man and which guarantees eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ, who, with His blood and righteousness, has earned and merited righteousness and life for the sinners.

"The full victorious conclusion "through Jesus Christ our Lord", διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν , belongs to the entire thought "grace might reign", ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ , to "eternal life", ζωὴν αἰώνιον , upon which he imprinted the seal" (Weiss).

What the Apostle says in 5:12-21 concerning the economy of righteousness and life evidently corresponds to that which he had previously taught in general concerning justification, but especially so to the content of the first half of the chapter, 5:1-11. There, he had mentioned not only justification, but especially had pointed to the future "salvation", σωτηρία , as the certain result of our justification. And, so, we agree with those expositors who refer διὰ τοῦτο in v.12 back to vv.1-11. But since the two halves of the chapter are essentially of the same content and do not have a definite relationship to one another as cause and effect, or as premise and result. Therefore, we take this διὰ τοῦτο not in its strict meaning quam ob causam, but in the sense which Schierlitz points out: " διὰ τοῦτο equals 'for that reason, therefore', most often only constituting the transition to a new cycle of thoughts, which, however, stand in close connection with the foregoing (Ro 5:12. Mt 23:34)." The meaning of the Apostle is "since it is as I have expounded above; namely, that we, after we are reconciled and justified through Jesus Christ, have the certain hope of eternal life". What I have explained above I put together into this sentence, "Even as by Adam's sin a judgment of death has come to all men, so also by the righteousness of Christ justification of life has come to all men." This sentence is the short summary of the second half of the chapter. In that Paul here presents Christ, in whom we have righteousness and life, as an antitype of Adam, the originator and source of sin and death, one can also say that he returns to that which he had previously taught concerning sin and its fatal results. Thus, in and with the section 5:12-21, he concludes his entire presentation from 1:18ff. concerning the doctrine of sin and grace.

The Pauline Doctrine of Justification according to Ro 1-5.

After our presentation of the first five chapters, we permit ourselves an excursus in which we sum up that which the Apostle has previously taught in this Letter (especially from 3:21 on) concerning justification, we will collect the similar expressions and present the different groupings of thought in an order which conforms to the subject matter. Thus, we will gain an overall picture of the Pauline doctrine of justification. For what Paul wrote elsewhere in his Letters concerning justification is related to this particular presentation of doctrine as an Epitome is related to a Solida Declaratio.

What Paul understands under justification is clear. The grammatically ascertained meaning of δικαιοῦν , δικαιοῦσθαι , δικαίωσις , and δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ; the synonymous expression "to impute as righteous", λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην; the identification of justification, of the imputation of righteousness with the forgiveness of sins; the contrast which is designated as "to accuse", ἐγκαλεῖν , and "condemnation", κατάκριμα ; and the general connection of the sections concerned remove any doubt that it here treats of the judgment of God over man of the justitia imputata. The interpretations of the Roman and romanizing theologians and of the Schleiermacher and Ritschl schools all make Paul mean the justitia infusa when he speaks of justification. This means, according to those interpreting an occurrence in the inner part of man, a moral transformation or disposition of man. It is a blow to the bright countenance of the Scriptures. Therefore, the question concerns how sinful man is justified before God; that is, how he receives a gracious judgment of God.

The answer reads in short, "We maintain that a man is justified by faith", λογιζόμεθα, πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι ἄνθρωπον . We are justified before God and appear before God as righteous. That is to say, God regards us as righteous "through faith", διὰ πίστεως (3:28-30); "out of faith", ἐκ πίστεως (3:30). Faith is accounted to us for righteousness (4:3,5,9,22,24).

The further question is: In what manner does faith justify? Most modern theologians, even those who take justification as a judicial act (actus forensis), see in faith, that condition of man, the real efficient causes (causa efficiens) of justification. They suppose that this faith, or condition of man, disposes and moves God to speak a gracious judgment to man, whether they take faith as obedience to God, or as a correct and God-pleasing disposition, or as the fulfillment of the essential duty of the creature to the Creator - or even if they define it correctly as acceptance of Christ (apprehensio Christi). These thoughts in particular are excluded intentionally by Paul. In 3:28, he explains "faith", πίστις , more exactly by "apart from the works of the Law:", χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου . He places "faith", πίστις , and "from works", ἐξ ἔργων and "the believer", ὁ πιστεύων and "the one who works", ὁ ἐργαζόμενος in contrast to one another (4:2,3,4,5). Faith, insofar as it justifies, is to him the antithesis of all the works of man, whether they are outward or inner works. It is the reverse of all his own actions and conduct. When God declares man righteous, He takes into consideration nothing of man's work and conduct.

The justifying power of faith lies solely in its object. Faith is a correlate concept - it is absolutely inconceivable without its object. Faith must have something to hold onto and upon which it depends. The grace of God generally appears as the object of faith. Especially in the concluding part of his

discourse on justification, the Apostle praises the boundless grace of God (5:15, 16,17,21). The grace of God - His free, underserved love - is the sole motivation of our justification. We are justified by His grace (3:24). We are justified freely, gratuitously, δωρεάν (3:24). We are justified "as a favor", κατὰ χάριν , and not "as what is due", κατ' ὀφείλημα (4:4-5). And it is faith which takes comfort in the grace of God. Faith, which introduces no work or merit of its own, holds to that which God, out of grace, gives and promises. With the ἐκ πίστεως , the κατὰ χάριν is established and given (4:16).

It is the grace of God and the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ; that is, it is the grace of God in Christ to which we owe our salvation (5:15). Throughout the entire text of 3:21-5:21, the precious name of Jesus Christ is evident. Jesus Christ is the Mediator of this salvation. We read repeatedly διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν or διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (5:11,17,21). God has proven His incomparable love and grace, in the fact that Christ has died for the godless (5:6-8), God has given Christ into death for the sake of our sins (4:25). Thus, in Christ we have redemption through His blood (3:24). Sin is atoned for (3:25). We are reconciled to God through the death of His Son (5:10). The divine righteousness is granted full satisfaction (3:25-26). Christ and His bloody merit, His perfect obedience and His passive and active obedience (5:18-19) is the firm, immovable foundation of our justification. We are justified through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus (3:24). And it is faith which grasps and appropriates Christ and His redemption. We believe in Jesus Christ (3:22-26) the crucified and risen One, whom God has given into death because of our sins and has raised Him up again (4:24-25). Christ is the "propitiation through faith", ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως (3:25).

Faith lays hold of Christ and His merit; but, in and with Christ and at the same time, the righteousness of Christ. That the righteousness which avails before God is present forever in Christ shines forth everywhere in the Apostle's presentation. That is already apparent in what he said concerning redemption, the atonement and reconciliation. The modernists dissipate and depreciate the concept of redemption, and reconciliation. They teach as if with redemption there is first created the possibility of justification or the forgiveness of sin; a possibility, which only later when faith enters in becomes a reality.

No, we are redeemed through Christ's death and blood. This means that we are actually released from sin and its guilt and punishment. Sin is atoned for through Christ's blood - He is the expiation by virtue of His blood, which means that sin is covered before the eyes of God. God no longer sees it, no longer regards it or accounts it to man. We are reconciled to God by the death of His Son, so that God now has nothing against us. God was in Christ and reconciled the

world to Himself, and He does not impute their sins to them. Thus with redemption, atonement and reconciliation, our justification, the non-imputation and forgiveness of sins, is established and given. With His death and blood, Christ has not only merited the righteousness which avails before God and the forgiveness of sins, but He has also affected and prepared these things. This is shown, as previously demonstrated, in the connection of, "being justified... Through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus", δικαιούμενοι... διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (3:24). In 5:9-10, Paul uses "reconciled", καταλλαγέντες, and "justified", δικαιωθέντες, as synonymous expressions.

The glorious raising of Jesus Christ from the dead, however, is the solemn, public declaration of righteousness and absolution. God has spoken it over the world of sinners and by it He has sealed the effect of the death of Christ (4:24-25). Yes, through Christ's righteousness, δικαίωμα, justification of life has already come to all men (5:18). The many, all men, are presented as righteous through the obedience of Christ. The obedience and righteousness of Christ, as the sin of the disobedience of Adam, has been imputed to all men (5:19). The judgement has been made and stands firm: God is "He who justifies the ungodly", ὁ δικαιῶν τοῦ ἀσεβῆ (4:5). Thus, in Christ, for all times and for all people the righteousness which avails before God, and in which man can stand before God is prepared.

Faith takes what is there, what is on hand. It appropriates this righteousness to itself. By faith we become partakers of the χάρισμα, the gracious gift of God, the gift of righteousness prepared by Christ (5:17). By faith we draw the judgment of justification, which God has spoken over the godless in genere, upon our person (4:5,24,25). Thus, the righteousness which avails before God is a "righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ", δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which becomes our own through faith (3:22). Also it is the "righteousness of God...from faith", δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ...ἐκ πίστεως, which becomes our portion as a result of faith (1:17). At the same time, it is the "righteousness of God...to faith", δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ εἰς πίστιν, which is intended for faith, that man should receive it in faith (1:17). It is a "righteousness of God", δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, which comes upon all who believe (3:22). In short, it is a "righteousness of faith", δικαιοσύνη πίστεως, (4:13); a righteousness which has this characteristic" that it is believed and grasped in faith. And, therefore, we are justified by faith or as a result of faith. Therefore, God regards him as righteous whose faith is in Jesus. Therefore, faith is accounted for righteousness and it justifies because it appropriates to itself the righteousness which avails before God, the judgment of justification of God. Thus, it enters into the personal possession of the same. In faith we take hold of and

cling to righteousness. Thus we have righteousness and are justified before God.

But we must still add on essential point. The δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is revealed in the Gospel, as already attested by the Law and the Prophets (1:17; 3:21). In the Gospel, God has publicly displayed Christ as the expiation for sin before all the world (3:25). The entire treasure of the gift of the grace of God - namely, Christ, His redemption, and the righteousness which avails before God - is enclosed in the Word and is brought forth and offered to sinners in and through the Word. The Word is the nearest object of faith. Faith clings to the Word, it embraces and accepts the Word, and, in the Word, lays hold on Christ and the righteousness which avails before God. The nature of faith is that it looks away from one's own person, own unworthiness, and own inability. It goes entirely outside of itself and leans and relies solely on the promise of God, which stands eternally firm and promises salvation, peace, righteousness and forgiveness of sins in Christ (4:19-21). And because faith applies to itself the Gospel's promise of righteousness and forgiveness of sins, the same is accounted for righteousness (4:22).

Later Lutheran dogmaticians and, similarly, most modern Lutherans differentiate between the object of faith in the bonum justificum, or the merit earned by Christ (meritum Christi), and the justification (justificatio), particularly justification before God (justitia coram Deo). They teach that only the first, and not the latter, is offered in the Word and laid hold of by faith. Justification itself would first come to pass, then, when man has taken Christ's merit in faith. With that the real, deciding judgment of God is removed from the Word. It is made uncertain and leads to the thought that, through this act of man (the trusting in Christ), this act of God, the justificatio, were first called forth. Above all, however, and most important for us this idea directly contradicts the Apostle's train of thought as presented above, according to which not only Christ and His redemption but also the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ and the δικαίωσις appear as content of the Word and object of faith. On the other hand, the real Lutheran type of doctrine, which is found in Luther and the Lutheran theologians of the 16th century as well as the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, is in all points the true reproduction of the Pauline doctrine of justification. The Apology IV and the Formula of Concord III completely coordinate the grace of God, the merit of Christ, the reconciliation with God, the forgiveness of sins, and the righteousness which avails before God. They consider these benefits in general to be comprehended in the Word and grasped by faith.

By way of example, we here quote one of the discussions of this doctrine previously referred to, Formula of Concord Solid Declaration, Article III. Justification is, first of all, defined as, "That a poor sinner is justified before God (that is, he is absolved and declared utterly free from all his sins, and from

the verdict of well deserved damnation, and is adopted as a child of God and an heir of eternal life) without any merit or worthiness of our part, and without any prededing, present or subsequent works, by sheer grace, solely through the merit of the total obedience, the bitter passion the death, and the resurrection of Christ, our Lord, whose obedience is reckoned to us as righteousness. The Holy Spirit offers these treasures to us in the promise of the Gospel, and faith is the only means whereby we can apprehend, accept, apply them to ourselves, and make them our own" (Tappert, pp.540-541). Thus the previously named blessings - Christ's merit and obedience, justification, absolution, adoption to sonship and heirship of eternal life - are offered to us in the Gospel applied by faith. Further, "Thus the following statements of St. Paul are to be considered and taken as synonymous: 'We are justified by faith' (Ro 3:28), or 'faith is reckoned to us as righteousness' (Ro 4:5), or when he says taht we are justified by the obedience of Christ, our only Mediator, or that 'one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men' (Ro 5:18). For faith does not justify because it is so good a work and so God-pleasing a virtue, but because it lays hold on and accepts the merit of Christ in the promise of the holy Gospel. This merit has to be applied to us and to be made our own through faith if we are to be justified thereby. Therefore the righteousness which by grace is reckoned to faith or to the believers is the obedience, the suffering, and the resurrection of Christ when He satisfied the Law for us and paid for our sin. Since Christ is not only man, but God and man in one undivided Person, He was as little under the Law - since He is the Lord of the law - as He was obligated to suffer and die for His Person. Therefore His obedience consists not only in His suffering and dying, but also in His spontaneous subjection to the law in our stead and his keeping of the law in so perfect a fashion that, reckoning it to us as righteousness, God forgives us our sins, accounts us holy and righteous, and saves us forever on account of this entire obedience which, by doing and suffering, in life and death, Christ rendered for us to His Heavenly Father. This righteousness is offered to us by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel and in the Sacraments, and is applied, appropriated, and accepted by faith, so that thus believers have reconciliation with God, forgiveness of sins, the grace of God, adoption, and the inheritance of eternal life"(Tappert p. 541). Thus, according to this, we are justified by faith or faith is reckoned to us as righteousness, not because it is such a good work and a God-pleasing virtue, but because "it lays hold on and accepts the merit of Christ in the promise of the holy Gospel."

However, Christ's merit, which faith lays hold of in the promise of the Gospel, includes the fact that, according to Ro 5, we are justified by the obedience of the one Mediator, Christ; that, by the righteousness of One,

justification of life has come upon all men; or, that God "forgives us our sins, accounts us as holy and righteous" because of the complete obedience of Christ, which He rendered to God in life and death. This righteousness (haec justitia), namely, that "God forgives us our sins and accounts us as holy and righteous" through the righteousness which avails before God and is affected through the obedience of Christ, is present before there was a written Word and faith. It is offered to us by the Gospel and applied, appropriated and received by faith. Therefore, the believers have reconciliation with God, forgiveness of sins, and God's grace. Because they have applied to themselves and accepted this righteousness, they therefore now have that which they have applied to themselves; in one word, "righteousness. Thus they stand before God as righteous.

The same nexus rerum comes to us in the following short statements of our Confessions. Aug. Conf., Art. VI, Concordia Triglotta, p. 45, "For remission of sins and justification is apprehended by faith." Aug. Conf., Art. XX, Triglotta, p.45, "that they might know that grace and forgiveness of sins and justification are apprehended by faith in Christ." Apology, Art. IV, Triglotta, p. 139, "For the Gospel convicts all men that they are under sin, that they are all subject to eternal wrath and death, and offers, for Christ's sake, remission of sin and justification, which is received by faith." Apology, Art. III, Triglotta, p. 179, "justification is only a matter freely promised for Christ's sake, and therefore is always received before God by faith alone." Formula of Concord, Art. III. Epitome. Triglotta, p. 793, "We believe, teach and confess that faith alone is the means and instrument whereby we lay hold of Christ, and thus in Christ of that righteousness which avails before God."

Luther's comment on Gn 15:6 is, "As for the verb , I do not object very much whether you take it to mean either 'to impute' or as 'to think'; for the result remains the same. When the Divine Majesty thinks about me that I am righteous, that my sins have been forgiven, that I am free from eternal death, and when I gratefully grasp this thought of God about me in faith, then I am truly righteous, not through my works but through faith, with which I grasp the divine thought.

For God's thought is infallible truth. Therefore when I grasp it with a firm thought - not with an uncertain and wavering opinion - I am righteous.

For faith is the firm and sure thought or trust that through Christ God is propitious and that through Christ His thoughts concerning us are thoughts of peace, not of affliction or wrath.

God's thought or promise, and faith, by which I take hold of God's promise - these belong together." (LW 3, p.21).

According to Luther, it is not the case that first man believes and, thereafter, God considers him righteous. Rather, the reverse is true: the divine majesty thinks of me as righteous and my sins are forgiven, and then I lay hold of and grasp these thoughts of God with my thoughts in faith. When I do that, then I am truly justified.

This genuinely Lutheran doctrine of Justification is the confession of the Evangelical Synodical Conference of North America. We quote a passage from the Synodical Conference Proceedings of 1872, which discusses the general justification and puts it into the right light of the relationship of faith to justification and guarantees the independence of the justifying judgment of God from all human conduct. "This doctrine - namely the doctrine of the general justification - is directly expressed in the passage, Ro 5:18. It is, therefore, not only a biblical doctrine but also a biblical expression that the justification of life has come upon all men. Only a Calvinistic exegesis can make this passage say that only the elect are justified. Older orthodox theologians of our Church also speak of the general justification merited for and offered to all. Gerhard says that Christ's resurrection is the general absolution; however, absolution is nothing else than justification. In Christ, the sinful world is condemned to death; in His resurrection, the world has been declared justified. When a pastor absolves, he distributes a treasure which is already available, namely, the already merited forgiveness of sins. If the treasure were not at hand, then no pastor could absolve. Yes, then we also could not speak of the justification of the sinner by faith, for to believe means to take what is there. If the world were not already justified, then to believe would have to mean to fulfill a work for justification. However, the entire preaching of the Gospel is a message from God cerning a righteousness which is already earned by Him and is present for everyone. Therefore, the statement that in Christ the justification of the entire world has already taken place, contains nothing deceitful, but it is even entirely biblical. Those who say that God has made the entire world righteous, but has not declared it righteous, thereby also essentially deny the entire justification.

The declaration of righteousness by the Father is not to be separated from the justification of the Son, since He has raised Christ from the dead. Certainly a man cannot possess righteousness and salvation if he does not accept justification. When the king pardons a company of criminals, then on his part they are all released from guilt and punishment. If one of these does not accept the pardon then he must atone further for his guilt. And so it is with sinners in the justification which has come about through Christ's death and resurrection. Indeed, if God had not written and sealed the letter of pardon, then we preachers would be liars and deceivers of the people if we said to them, 'Only believe, then you are justified'.

However, God has signed the letter of grace for sinners by the resurrection of His Son. He has furnished it with His divine seal, and therefore we can confidently preach that the world is justified and reconciled to God. The latter expression one could not use, if the former were not true."

The Pauline doctrine of justification finally leads to a mystery which we cannot solve. The Apostel testifies, on the one hand, that the justification of life has come over all men; on the other hand, he testifies that all the world is guilty and punishable before God, ὑπόδικος (3:19). But there is no self-contradiction. It is a double manner of contemplation of the same object. The first time the world is considered in Christ; the second, outside of Christ. Outside of Christ, God is angry at the sinners; in Christ, God looks upon the sinful world with eyes of pleasure. The one is a judgment of the Law; the other, a judgment of the Gospel over sinful mankind. But, in our thoughts, we cannot reconcile this double manner of contemplation. We cannot grasp, understand or explain how both of these things together take place in God, that outside of Christ He accounts to the world their sins and that in Christ HE has absolved the world from their sins.

The Synodical Conference Proceedings (quoted above) reads, "One must differentiate between two ways of God looking upon man. When God regards the world in Christ, His Son, then He regards them with the deepest love; but when He regards the world outside of Christ, then He cannot look at them any other way than with burning wrath. ... Accordingly God did two things; He was angered over the sinners, but at the same time He loved them so zealously that He gave His only begotten Son for them. ... this is an inexpressible and unfathomable mystery. God does not change as we do, who are first inclined one way and then another, who now have these feelings, now those. Of Him it is written, "Thou remainest as Thou art.: Everything that God thinks and wills is one with His essence. ... Now this is the Lutheran way: If we find two things in God's Word which we cannot harmonize, we let both stand and we believe both, just as they read."

But we must still add the following to that. The object of the redemption and justification which has taken place through Christ is all of sinful mankind. However, we must set aside how the individual people stand toward Christ and the Gospel. The justification of all has taken place as if in the darkness. When God through Christ reconciled the world to Himself and absolved it of sin, the world knew nothing about it. But to the counsel of the salvation of God, also belonged the other fact, that through the Gospel God manifested, and made known to man, Christ and His work and blessing, so that a man might recognize them and appropriate them to himself in faith. And whoever believes, whoever in faith accepts the Gospel and in the Gospel Christ and in Christ the righteousness which

avails before God, is justified. He thereby passes from the state of sin and wrath (status peccati et irae) into the state of grace (status gratias) and the state of righteousness (5:2). He is a child of God's good will upon whom God's wrath no longer rests. And so the believers, in whom the redemption and justification fulfill their purpose and goal and remain upon, are the redeemed of the Lord (Is 35:10; 62:12). On the other hand, whoever does not believe, whoever rejects the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ, thereby sets aside, for his own person, the power and effect of God's grace and of Christ's redemption and forgiveness, ἀθετοῦ . For such a one, Christ has died in vain (Ga 2:21). With such unbelief, he returns the force and effect of forgiven sin and obliterated guilt. He is now doubly a child of wrath and condemnation.

Justification, the righteousness which avails before God, is the preliminary condition and the most certain guarantee of the future salvation, σωτηρία , and of the heavenly inheritance (1:16-17; 4:13-16; 5:5-10). The justification of life has come to pass for all men. Salvation has been merited and prepared by Christ for all men and awarded to all, so that they are justified. Still, only those who are partakers of the gift of righteousness through faith shall actually reign with Christ in eternal life in the future.

CHAPTER 6

Chapter 6:1-14 Sanctification as a Proof of the State of Being a Christian

6,1.2.

The Apostle here begins the discussion anew, in that he writes: Τὸ οὖν ἐροῦμεν , "What shall we say then;" Ponitur autem τὸ οὖν ἐροῦμεν; non tibi tantummodo, ubi quid jam dicere aut effari possit aliquis exquirat, verum etiam tum, quum quid jam in disputando dicere h.e. ex antegressis colligere possit aliquis percontatur. Ibi formula quid ergo est? quid ergo inde efficitur? notat. Sic hoc loco, ubi percontationem quid igitur dicemus (e superioribus eruemus)? nova et quae sui juris sit interrogatio excipit: Num adhaereamus-? (It says here not only now when he searches what to say or express, but also when someone persistently asks what to say in disputing, that is, what to gather from what has gone before. Here the form is 'What follows therefore?' 'What is effected thereby?' Thus here, where the questioning renews the persistent inquiry: 'What do we draw from the above?' a new interrogation is elicited: whether we adhere---?) Fritzsche. Thus: What results from the previous remark from where sin has abounded? Has grace become superabundant? 5,20.21. In general, what follows from the doctrine of grace? We continue in sin, so that grace might increase and so that God might have the greater opportunity to manifest His grace, to forgive sin? The subjunctive ἐπιμενοῦμεν, "shall we continue in," which is better documented than the future "we will continue in," is the so-called conjunctivus deliberativus (deliberative subjunctive). This is a conclusion which the opponents of the Christians drew from the Christian doctrine. They repeated after the Christians, as we have read this is 3,8, that they taught thus and also operated according to this maxim: Let us do evil, that good might result. Similarly, in later times, the Christian doctrine of justification by grace has been misinterpreted and perverted, as if it granted sin support and undermined true morality. The Christians themselves rejected this conclusion with indignation and said with Paul: μὴ γένοιτο "God forbid." Only the one

who does not know grace could conclude and speak thus. Whoever has recognized and experienced a little of what grace means, hates and abhors sin, and thanks God for His grace in both word and deed. The Christians, who have become partakers of the grace of God through faith, confess: How can we, who are dead to sin, henceforth still live unto sin? That is quite impossible for us. To the expression ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῷ, "will live in it (sin), Fritzsche remarks: Ζῆν ἐν τινι πράγματι, wherein to live and move, to be intent upon a thing. Cic. ad Fam. 9,26: Vivas, inquis, in litteris, ("Live, you say, in your books!") And Philippi: "To live in sin equals to continue the living, association, the relationship, the connection with it. Similarly περιπατεῖν ἐν τινι, 2 Cor 4,2; Eph 4,17. Still περιπατεῖν is the outward appearance of the ζῆν, which predominately designates the inner spiritual association, cf. Col 3,7; Ga 5,25.

The double question and its denial, with which the Apostle begins the new section of the Letter, already lets it be seen significantly what he now has in view. After he had presented the doctrine of sin and of grace, he now comes to speak of the life and conduct of the Christian (sanctification), as the necessary result of justification and of justifying faith. That is the content of the third principal part of the Letter, chap. 6-8, as this is almost unanimously agreed by ancient and modern commentators. Tertia hujus epistolae pars et principalis propositio sequitur, agens de navitate vitae et studio bonorum operum. Nam pertractatis hactenus et explicatis daubus partibus, quae sunt, homines esse peccatores, et sola fide justificare, recte accedit ad tertiam, eamque aliquot argumentis confirmat cum declaratione causarum, quare fide justificate debeant pie vivere. (The third part and principle proposition of this epistle follows, treating of the newness of life and zeal for good works. After treating and explaining the two parts so far, which are 'that men are sinners' and 'justification is by faith alone,' he (Paul) rightly proceeds to the third. This he confirms with arguments and a declaration of reasons, why those justified by faith alone should live piously. Koerner.

That the Christians continue in sin and serve sin, is excluded thereby, that they are dead to sin. The Emphasis lies upon the οὗτοι ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, "we who died to sin." That would not say, as some have often taken it, that we have renounced sin. In case we would still live in sin, this latter condition would contradict our former condition. By the Apostle, when he denies that we continue in sin, refers particularly to the conduct of the Christians, which had begun with becoming a Christian. This brings into prominence the fact that the conduct of the Christians is determined by the fact that they are dead

to sin. "ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ does not mean something which the Christians have done, but something which has taken place in them. . . the event with which life ceases, something to be determined by its relation to sin." Hoffman That we are dead to sin is a similar expression, as when it says that the Christians are dead to the Law. 7,4; Ga 2,19. In these turns of expression sin, like the Law, appears as a power which determines the conduct of man. The Christians are dead to sin, that is, they have become free from that drawing to sin. Their life is now no longer ruled and regulated by sin or the Law, as it was previously. We are dead to sin; that means: we are freed from the power, might, lordship, from the curse and control of sin. Mortum esse peccato est a peccati dominio et oppressione liberatum esse, non autem plane a peccato ejusque sensu liberum esse. (To be dead to sin is to be freed from the dominion and oppression of sin, but clearly not from sin and its meaning). Calov. "Deliverance from sin, as offered by Christ, and as accepted by the believer, is not mere deliverance from its penalty, but from its power." Hodge. Such deliverance from the power and dominion of sin is not something which we have done, but something which God has done for us. This happened since we became Christians and were justified by faith. In that the guilt of sin was forgiven us, we were at the same time delivered from the might and power of sin. This deliverance from the bonds of sin, which was accomplished by God, is the innermost nerve of Christian sanctification. The state of the Christian is a state of freedom from sin. It follows that the Christians, in that which concerns their personally conduct, no longer live in sin.

Vv. 3-11.

That we are dead to sin the Apostle proves in v. 3 in a question introduced with ἢ ἄγνοεῖτε, which reminded the Christians of a fact well known to them: ἢ ἄγνοεῖτε ὅτι, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν? The meaning is: "Or do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death?" That we are dead to sin, but we should think only of our well known significance of our baptism. All we who are baptized into Christ Jesus are baptized into His death. Βαπτίζεσθαι in the New Testament, with the exception of Mark 7,4, always designates the religious act of baptizing with water, the baptism of John and then the Christian Baptism. This is also true of the substantive βάπτισμα. Since the original meaning "to dip" has fallen into disuse, in such expressions as βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομα τινος, "to baptize into what name." Mt 28,19; Ac 8,16; 19,5; 1 Cor 1, 13.15, εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν, "into Moses," 1 Cor 10,2, εἰς Χριστόν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, "into Christ," "into Christs' death," the basis for

understanding is not, as if the person receiving Baptism were baptized into Moses, into Christ, into Christ's name, into Christ's death. The εἰς points to the relationship into which the one who is baptized is placed over against the respective person or thing. We have been baptized into Christ Jesus, which means nothing else than that by Baptism we have been placed into a relationship to Christ Jesus. "Christian Baptism is actually a sharing in Jesus and in the salvation merited by Him. In the same sense, however, it then also reads εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθητε "You were baptized into His death." Hofmann. Christ has become the Mediator of salvation and has earned salvation for us through His death. In that He has taken our sins upon Himself and atoned for and reconciled us through His suffering and death, Christ has redeemed us from the guilt and punishment of sin, therewith at the same time also from sin itself. Christ has also, by His death, broken the power of sin. And now we also, because we have been baptized into Christ, have been baptized into His death. Thus through the baptism of His death and the effects of His death, we have become partakers of His redemption, namely of the redemption not only from the punishment, but also from the power of sin.

The apostle had previously pointed to the Gospel as the means through which God presents and imparts the man Christ, Christ's merit, forgiveness of sins and the righteousness which avails before God. In this text he testifies that we have received a share in Christ and in the fruit of His death through Baptism. The one does not exclude the other. God has ordained and established two means of grace, the gospel and baptism, word and sacrament. The mention of Baptism is certainly in place, where the Christians are reminded of the beginning of their state of Christianity. For by Baptism we have become Christians. Baptism is the sacramentum initiationis (the just sacrament). Christ has commanded His disciples in Mt 28,18-20 "to make disciples of," μαθητεύσατε, all nations, thereby, that they baptize them, βαπτίζοντες etc. According to Acts 2,14 those Jews and converts to Judaism, who were baptized on Pentecost, were thereby added to the Church. That was the beginning of the first Christian congregation in Jerusalem. The Apostle, when he writes ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν "who have been baptized into Christ Jesus," has in mind, first of all, such Christians who were baptized as adults. He himself had received Baptism in his mature age and most of the members of the Roman congregation had formerly been Gentiles and Jews. The baptism of adults follows the proclamation of the Gospel. In the command of Christ to baptize, Mt 28, 18ff., baptism and teaching are combined. On Pentecost those Jews and proselytes were baptized, who previously had heard the sermon of Peter

concerning Christ and had received it with joy. Acts 2,41. The adults, who can understand human speech and doctrine, are placed into connection with Christ, Christ's death and resurrection through the Word. With these baptism is the seal and confirmation of the promise of grace of the Gospel. Since the instruction preceding baptism first of all aims at baptism, Christ has expressly ordained baptism as a sacramentum initiationis (the just sacrament), with full right Paul considers and designates baptism as a beginning of the Christian status (state), and a means of union with Christ. The children and the immature, on the other hand, who are still not able to grasp the word, entered into the communion with Christ and His death solely by baptism, with the baptismal act itself. There were also baptized children already everywhere in the first Christian congregations. We remarked above on v.2 that we, since we became Christians, are dead to sin. Becoming Christians coincides with becoming believers. The Scriptures throughout place coming to faith, "to believe," as the beginning of the status of a Christian. But that does not contradict that which Paul writes in this passage regarding baptism. According to Christ's command of baptism, baptism and faith are related. "He who has believed and has been baptized shall be saved." Mark 16,16. In Ga 3,26.27 it reads: "For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ." Through baptism and faith we have put on Christ, we have entered into communion with Christ and have thereby become the children of God. In this passage the ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν includes faith. For the relationship, the communion with Christ which is designated with εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν is not possible, is not conceivable without faith. Faith is certainly nothing else than personal contact with Christ. Word and Sacrament are media δοτικὰ and have as a correlate faith as a medium ληπτικόν. Faith, which is brought about among adults by the Word, among children by the baptismal act, takes and applies to itself that which God presents and imparts in Word and Sacrament--Christ and the fruits of His death. Whoever believes then becomes a partaker of Christ and His redemption and is thus free and liberated not only from the guilt and punishment of sin, but also from the power and and bonds of it.

When the Apostle continues in v. 4: "Therefore we have been buried with Him through baptism into death in order that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too, might walk in newness of life." Then it does not follow out of the death of Christ, which was mentioned before, (but out of) His burial, (for) out of our sharing in Christ's death

(is) our sharing in Christ's burial. But the emphasis lies on the purpose clause and its confirmation in v. 5, on the statement of the resurrection of Christ and our sharing in Christ's resurrection. In this entire section these two facts, Christ's death and Christ's resurrection, our sharing in Christ's death and Christ's resurrection, are placed over against one another. Only here, in v. 4, is mention made of the burial. The thought that we are baptized into Christ's death, v. 3, one can also express thus, that in baptism we have died with Christ, that we have died in a spiritual manner. In baptism we Christians have experienced a dying. Since we have died to sin, we Christians have been taken from the power of sin. There is a dying with Christ, in that we have been baptized into the death of Christ and have thus become partakers of the death of Christ and the fruits of the same. This thought is again taken up in v. 4, only in another, stronger form, with οὖν "therefore". St. Paul says: "We have been buried with Him through baptism into death". συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον. The words εἰς τὸν θάνατον are often combined with διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, and therefore are generally understood under the θάνατον the death of Christ. But then after the αὐτοῦ the, τὸν θάνατον must not be omitted. Without αὐτοῦ the words give only the meaning that we are baptized, buried in that spiritual death, which corresponds to the death of Christ. That would still be no clear presentation that we are buried in our own death. The εἰς behind βαπτίσματος then would have, as Hofmann especially emphasizes, a different meaning from the double εἰς behind the double ἐβαπτίσθημεν in v. 3. We rather refer εἰς τὸν θάνατον to συνετάφημεν with Hofmann, Luthardt and others and take θάνατον as a condition of death. "To be buried into death" is only a stronger expression for "to die". Whoever is buried now belongs to the dead. We have died unto sin and entirely dead unto sin. The chain which bound us to sin is completely severed. That is the meaning. Since through baptism we have died and been buried with Christ we have thus become partakers of the death and burial of Christ. Christ's burial was also only a conclusion of His suffering and death, a proof and confirmation of His death. When Christ lay in the grave, there He appeared before the whole world as one of the dead. Now that we have died and been buried with Christ has the purpose which was the aim of God with all this, that, as Christ has been raised from the dead, so also we should walk "in newness of life," ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς. That we should walk in newness of life or in a new life--that was the finis ultimus (the ultimate purpose). From the time of our baptism we Christians stand in a new life. This has its equal in the new life to which Christ has

been raised. Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of God. God's glory or majesty is the epitome of all divine attributes and perfection. Here especially we have to think of the omnipotence of God. With His resurrection, Christ has entered into a new life. And to that corresponds the new life in which the baptized Christians stand. That is the tertium comparationis (the point of comparison), nothing else. The ἐκ νεκρῶν "from the dead", which applies to the resurrection of Christ, has no correlate in the parallel. In other connections, for example, Eph 2, 1ff., Paul states that we Christians are raised from the dead with Christ. There with the death from which we are raised he means the spiritual, moral deadness, the condition when we were dead in sins, entangled completely in sins and as if drowned in sins. Out of this condition we have come, this we have overcome, when we were raised spiritually. The spiritual dying, on the other hand, of which Paul speaks in Ro 6, is an entirely different thing from which one generally, according to Eph 2, calls the spiritual death, that is the opposite of entanglement in sin, cf. the slavery of sin, of the service of sin, namely, deliverance from the bonds of sin. It cannot be said in a reasonable manner that we have been raised up from sin. That we are dead to sin is the negative side, that we stand in a new life is the positive side of sanctification.

How this new life has developed in us is stated in the following sentence: "For if we have become united with Him in the likeness of His death, certainly we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection." v.5. Εὖ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα. We are planted together, namely in Baptism, σύμφυτοι can mean only this, with the ὁμοίωμα τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, namely, of Christ. That can only mean that we are grown together with the death of Christ itself and have entered into the closest relation with it, not: our own spiritual dying. for a man is never planted together with himself, but always with another person. Still because the death of Christ has an similarity in our spiritual death, therefore the Apostle here calls the same an ὁμοίωμα, something which is like or similar to it. Ὅμοίωμα is to be taken here concretely in the sense of picture, image, and τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ as a genitive of apposition. The protasis in v. 5a therefore says essentially the same thing as the foregoing sentences, that we are baptized into the death of Christ and that by Baptism we are buried with Christ in death. From this fact, there follows the other, and upon that lies the emphasis, that we are also grown together with the resurrection of Christ. In the apodosis in v. 5b there is to be supplied τῷ ὁμοιώματι before τῆς ἀναστάσεως and σύμφυτοι before ἐσόμεθα out of the protasis. The future

ἐσόμεθα is the futurum logicum (future logic) and designates that which from the standpoint of our spiritual death, of the dying with Christ is in the future. In reality it lies in the past. For in this entire section, vv. 3-11, Paul points back to that which we have experienced in our Baptism. Thus in our Baptism we have also grown together with the resurrection of Christ, which is thus a similitude of our spiritual resurrection, which necessarily follows out of the being grown together with His death. With Christ, death and resurrection were close together. Christ is the crucified and risen One. Thus whoever has a share in His death also is a partaker of His resurrection. In the preceding, in v.4, it was only stated that the new life in which we Christians stand has its equal (ὡσπερ) with the resurrection of Christ. That is true also in the ὁμοίωμα. But here, in v.5, it is now added that our new life springs and flows from the resurrection of Christ. In Baptism we have received a share in the resurrection of Christ and the new life, into which Christ has entered with His resurrection. In Baptism the new life of Christ, is implanted in us, therefore we are flesh of His flesh, bone of His bone, Eph 5,30. We are born again to a new life, therefore the new life has come to us, in which we Christians now stand and walk.

V.6 continues: τοῦτο γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη etc., "knowing this, that our old self was crucified with Him," etc. Into the τοῦτο γινώσκοντες too much is implied, when, as, for example, Hofmann, Luthardt, Philippi and Meyer, take it as "empirical perception." They see therein the development of the discourse, that the Apostle, who had previously taught and spoken objectively, now speaks of that which is known to the Christian from his own experience. The τοῦτο γινώσκοντες runs parallel to the ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε "Or do you not know" in v.3, as well as to the εἰδότες "knowing" in v.9. The entire section, vv.3-11, contains a reminder. The Apostle reminds the Christian of that which they learned when they became Christians. The participial clause, τοῦτο γινώσκοντες etc., brings a closer explanation and further exposition of that which was said previously. We Christians know and consider that our old man is crucified with Him. "The παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, the old man is the sinful self. . . . He is looked upon as παλαιός from the standpoint or the ἀναγέννησις, of the παλιγγενεσία "regeneration" (John3,3; Tt3,5), the former, the past man, which is contrasted to the ἄνθρωπος νεός "new self," which is created by the regeneration, to the καινός "new" or the καινὴ κτίσις, "new creature." Eph 4,24; Col 3,9.10; 2 Cor 5,17. The expression παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος thus contains a personification not of the former way of acting (in Col 3,9

the πράξεσεν αὐτοῦ "its evil deeds" is differentiated from the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος himself), but of the former (sinful) condition or basic tendency of the entire life." Philippi. The old man is the sinful, corrupt habitus (attitude) of the man, the condition and manner of disposition which is established by the sinful conception and birth, out of which come forth all sinful desires, thoughts and exertions of the will. This old man is now crucified with Christ, namely, in Baptism, in that by Baptism we have become partakers of Christ's death by crucifixion and the fruits of the same. The old Adam is drowned, put to death in Baptism, which would say that he has lost all power over us. But that has happened with this purpose: ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, "that the body of sin might be destroyed". This purpose is also realized among baptized Christians. Τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is not sin as an organism (Philippi and others), and τῆς ἁμαρτίας thus is not the genitive of apposition. τῆς ἁμαρτίας is the genitive of the characteristic attribute and τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας evidently is the same as τὸ θνητὸν σῶμα, v. 11 τὸ σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου, 7,24, is thus the real body, as Luther has translated it, "the sinful body" not as if the body were the real location or even the source of sin, but as the organ or instrument of sin (Godet). Sin or the old Adam seeks through the medium (middle) of the body and the members of the body to fulfill the evil lusts and also does fulfill them in natural man. Among the baptized Christians, on the other hand, the body of sin is put out of activity. Καταργηθῆναι is to be taken here in its original, real meaning, inertem, inefficacem reddi (Grimm). Where the old man is crucified, the power of sin is broken. There also the body of sin is put out of power and activity. That the purpose of disempowering of the body of sin and the final, ultimate purpose of the crucifixion of the old man: τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ "that, we should, no longer be slaves to sin." That is God's will and aim, that henceforth we no longer serve sin as previously. Our Baptism has empowered us for this. We need no longer serve sin, because the old Adam is put to death and no longer rules the body.

That we no longer need to serve sin is confirmed in v.7 by the general axiom: "For he who has died is freed from sin" ὁ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας states essentially the same thing as that the old man is crucified, that we are dead to sin. With δικαιοῦσθαι here is not meant the absolution from the guilt of sin, since the Apostle here no longer speaks of justification, in the solemn sense of the word, although the same supposition and foundation for this δικαιοῦσθαι is what Paul here has in mind. In the entire section,

vv.3-11, the discussion is concerning the release from sin itself, from the power and dominion of sin. The power which sin has over man can be considered as a claim of title, which sin asserts against man. Sin, the mistress, places upon man who is conceived and born in sin the demand that he must serve her. Now whoever has died is released from sin, from this δίκη "punishment," and has been freed from the jurisdiction of sin. That is a general truth, which refers first of all to physical death. So also Meyer, Weiss, Hofmann, Godet. Whoever has died physically is taken away thereby from the tyranny, from the jurisdiction of sin. For sin and the service of sin falls into this earthly life and the judgment enters in at death. After death the wages of sin shall be paid to the servants of sin. Man shall then be rewarded for what he has done in his earthly life. This general axiom, applies also to the moral death, of which the entire section treats, which we Christians have experienced in our Baptism. We have died with Christ, our old man is crucified with Christ, and thus sin has lost all power and right over us. We no longer need to serve and obey sin. Nil jam in eum (qui mortuus est) juris est peccato, ut non jam sit debitor, "For in him (who is dead) it is not of the law unto sin, so that he is no longer a debtor." c.8,12. Bengel. The final clause τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ marks the progress of the thought. From our participation in the death of Christ the Apostle concludes our participation in the life of Christ: "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." v.8. The future συζήσομεν αὐτῷ "we shall also live with Him" we understand in like manner as the expression τὸ ὁμολώματι τῆς ἀναεστάσεως σύμφυτοι ἐσόμεθα, v.5. Here that earlier statement is not simply repeated, but explains more fully what kind of a new life that is, in which we Christians stand from our Baptism on: "knowing that Christ, having been raised from the dead, is never to die again; death no longer is master over Him. For the death that He died, He died to sin, once for all; but the life that He lives, He lives to God. Even so consider yourselves to be dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus." Vv.9-11. It is first of all stated concerning Christ, what the characteristics of His present life are. Something similar then also applies to us, because in Baptism we have become partakers of the resurrection of Christ. Christ, having been raised from the dead, dies no more. Death no longer has dominion over Him. With the life into which Christ has entered with His resurrection the situation is quite different from His former life on earth, Christ's earthly life was subject to death and had found its end with His death and burial. How the present life of Christ is characterized

is stated by the sentence, second part of which has the stress: "For the death that He died, He died unto sin, once for all; but the life that He lives, He lives to God." The expression ὃ ἀπέθανε "the death that He died" is to be analyzed: τὸν θάνατον , ὃν ἀπέθανεν "the death that He died." Concerning the death of Christ it applies that He is dead to sin. When it is said of Christ: τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν "He died to sin," then it is to be taken just as when it is said of us ἀπεθανόμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ "we died to sin," v.2. The dative τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ is here as there the dative of relation. Christ also with His death has become free in relation to sin, only that He had a different relationship to sin than we have. The former life of Christ, which ended with His death, was also determined and ruled by sin, namely, the alien sin, the sin of mankind, which He had taken upon Himself. What Christ has done, experienced, and suffered in the days of His flesh applied to sin, served the one purpose, to abolish the sin of mankind. This purpose has been fulfilled with His death. Sin has now once and for all been expiated, abolished and put away. Therefore also for us by virtue of our Baptism into the death of Christ, sin has been put away. For Christ this former relationship to sin has ceased with His death. Now and for all eternity He has nothing more to do with sin. In that He now lives, since He has been raised from the dead, He lives unto God. His present life has a relationship only to God, is determined solely by God, is turned to God. The divine nature and glory has now also permeated His physical essence and life. With His resurrection He has entered into the status gloriae, (the state of glorification). Vivit Deo, vitamex Deo gloriosam, divine vigoris plenam (He lives unto God, a glorious life from God, full of divine power). Bengel. "Even so consider yourselves to be dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus." Just as Christ, we Christians are also dead to sin and alive unto God. We find ourselves now in a divine condition and life, because the new life of Christ has been implanted in us by Baptism. Only that the ζῆν τῷ θεῷ "He lives to God," "with Christ applies to the physical condition of His natural life, with us, on the other hand, it applies to the ethical condition of our personal life." Hofmann. Since His resurrection Christ lives entirely to God, in every respect, also according to His body. Since our Baptism we live to God according to the inward man. The new life of regeneration is directed toward God. The new man who is created in Baptism is turned to God, rejoices in God, speaks, thinks, loves, and wills only what is of God. Thus we now live in God with Christ and at the same time "through Jesus Christ our Lord." We live in communion with Christ and thus our life is concluded with Christ in God.

The last statement, v.11, contains at the same time a short recapitulation of the entire exposition in vv.3-10. Therefore we Christians should hold concerning ourselves, λογίζεσθε "consider yourselves," that we are dead to sin and alive to God. "Thus we should judge concerning ourselves; for the empirical reality often makes itself feel in a different manner." Luthardt. Often we feel very little of the divine nature, on the other hand, sin often makes itself still very perceptible in us. Therefore, we should simply believe that which God's Word says to us, that we are free from sin, that we really conceal in ourselves a divine life. This status quo (the existing state of affairs) presented by God, this which we have not done but have received in Baptism, is the most inner nerve of sanctification. That is the source out of which the real Christian conduct flows. This is the foundation upon which the Apostle now builds his admonition to a right Christian conduct.

Vv. 12-14.

On the basis of the foregoing reminder the Apostle now admonishes, v.12: Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι "Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body." Grammatically the admonition is directed to sin, according to the sense it is directed to the Christians. The meaning is that the Christians should no longer permit sin to reign over them. That presupposes that sin is still present in them, although it has lost its power it has ceased to be their mistress. They should not concede dominion to sin and no longer serve sin. Luther makes a gloss: "Note, the saints still have evil lusts in the flesh, which they do not follow." Christians should not permit sin to reign in their mortal body. The θνητὸν σῶμα cannot possibly mean the body together with the soul, as Philippi accepts according to several ancient expositors. It is not the whole man according to body and soul, insofar as he is still not regenerated. Paul writes in 8,11 that God shall one day give life to our mortal bodies from the dead. But it is only the body which dies and is raised again on the Last Day. The ἐν τῷ θνητῷ σώματι "simply gives the sphere in which the forbidden dominion would take place." Meyer. The body appears here also not as the real seat of the sin; but as the instrument through which sin, when it reigns in man, fills its will. The Apostle speaks here of the mortal, not, as above, of the sinful body. The mortal body, which the Christians also still bear is a defective instrument of the Spirit, which easily gives in to the will of sin precisely because it is mortal. The following infinitive clause, which according to the best manuscripts is to be read εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ, "that you should obey its lusts," shows where the tendency of sin leads, namely, that the Christians obey the evil lusts and desires. The

evil desires. which come forth out of the evil heart, are here ascribed to the body, to the extent that they will express themselves out through the body. Thus St. John speaks of an ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν "lust of the eyes." 1 John 2,16. And now from the body the discussion passes over to the members of the body. VI3a. The Christians should not present their members as instruments of the unrighteousness of sin or place them at the disposal of sin, παριστάνετε "present." Whoever does that places himself under the dominion of sin. The Christians should prevent and stop this. Ἀδικία "unrighteousness," includes everything which runs contrary to the divine rule and law. Ὅπλα we take best of all in the meaning "instruments," which it often has in classical Greek. For the image of a military service, of war and battle, lies far from our context. Grimm: ὅπλα, instrumentum (instruments); ὅπλα ἀδικίας "instruments of unrighteousness," quibas scelus committitur, opp., (by which a crime is committed, the opposite), ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης "instruments of righteousness," quibas virtus exercetur, (by which a virtue is exercised), Ro 6,13. Thus, that is the meaning of the Apostle, therein the sanctification proves itself, that the Christians constrain the members of their bodies, hands, feet, eyes, ears, tongue, etc., and hold them back from the service of sin. That the Christians do not permit it to come to the point that the evil lusts and desires find their satisfaction through the service of the members. And that is no outward thing, no physical exercise, no athletic test of strength, but a moral conduct and act of the will. The will of the Christian resists the will of sin and holds the body and members in bounds, so that it suppresses and crucifies at the same time the evil lusts of the heart. Calov: Quod autem corporis et membrorum mentionem facit, non eo accipiendum, ac si in corpore tantum dominetur (peccatum), anima vero a pravis desideriis immunis sit, nec peccati dominio subijci possit, sed quod in corpore et membris corporeis apertius sese exserat peccatum, quodque non permissio dominio peccati in corpore ac membris corporeis, nec in nervum ita erumpere peccatum aut vim suam plene exserere aut vires etiam eas acquirere possit, quo nos captivet et in miseram servitutem redigat, et ex adverso imminuatur ita ac fragatur vis concupiscentiae et desideriorum, dum non permittitur tale dominium: ubi tamen intermittenda etiam non est veteris hominis ac desideriorum inde prorumpentium subactio, cohibitio et repressio, (But that he makes mention of the body and members is not to be understood as if (sin) dominated only in the body, and the soul were immune to deprave desires and could not be subjected to the dominion of sin. It is rather to be understood that sin spreads itself in the body and the bodily members more observedly. But when such dominion

is not allowed in the body and its members, sin cannot break out into the nerve to exercise its strength fully or to acquire those forces, by which it would capture us and reduce us to wretched servitude. On the other hand, the strength of concupiscence and desires is weakened and broken while it is not allowed such dominion. There should be no interruption in the discipline, restraint, and repression of the old man and of the desires which erupting from him.)

That is the negative side of sanctification. To that is added the positive admonition: "But present yourselves to God as those alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness to God." V.13b. The Christians should present themselves to God, place themselves at His disposal as "those alive from the dead," ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας. This latter expression does not look back to νεκροὺς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ "dead to sin," v.11. For there the discussion was concerning the fact that the Christians are dead to sin. The ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῆν, on the other hand, presupposes a condition of being dead in sin and through sin, as it is described in Eph 2,1ff. Thus here we have to think of that form of death, which we usually call the spiritual death. What the Apostle had previously said concerning the reign of sin, which the Christians should prevent, lies close to this thought. Those who are now Christians, formerly when they were still Gentiles, stood under the dominion of sin and walked in all lusts and vices. They were spiritually dead. And out of this death they have now become alive and now as such they should present themselves to God, commend themselves to God with body and soul, with heart, mind and thoughts. That takes place above all in daily prayer. At the same time they should present their members as instruments of righteousness,--and that is here the righteousness of life,--for the disposal of God. Hand, feet, eyes, ears, tongue, etc., should be busy constantly in the service and praise of God.

In order to understand and evaluate this double admonition correctly, one must actually hold oneself faithfully to the connection of the same with the preceding reminder. The correct Christian conduct follows of itself from the Christian condition, from that which the Christians have experienced in their Baptism and possess from the time of their Baptism. The Apostle impresses (this) upon the Christians, and Christian preachers should also speak of this to their Christians: You have died to sin, are dead to sin Christ with His death has redeemed you from sin, from the power and dominion of sin. You have become partakers of His redemption by Baptism. The power of sin in you has been broken! Your old man is crucified. The bond which

bound you to sin has been broken! You are free, inwardly free, actually free from sin! You no longer need to serve sin, therefore, no longer serve sin! Let not sin rule over you again and prove it indeed, that you are free from sin. You are raised with Christ. In Baptism you have become partakers of the resurrection life of Christ, therefore, a new, spiritual, divine life has been implanted in you, you actually stand in a new life. Now, therefore, also manifest this new life, use and exercise the powers which are in you, and live and serve God with body and soul. By such admonition, a Christian preacher actually disposes his Christians and places them in the condition and makes them willing to follow after that to which he has admonished them. It is an evangelical admonition which lies before us here, which is based on the Gospel and directed to the believing Christians and always has its effect among Christians.

In v.14 the Apostle once again leads back to the actual possession of the Christians, in that he gives them the assurance that sin shall not be master over them, can and shall not conquer them. They find themselves in a condition of freedom from sin. Sin has lost its dominion, its κυριότης. That comes from that fact that they are not under the Law, which only demands but does not give the power to fulfill the demand. They are under grace, which enables them to avoid the evil and to do that which is good and righteous before God. Gratia non solum peccata diluit, sed ut non peccamus facit, (Grace not only washes away sin, but also causes that we may not sin.) Augustine.

The Summary of the Entire Section, 6,1-14: The Apostle admonishes the Christians to no more serve sin but to walk in righteousness. He reminds them of the fact that in Baptism they have died to sin with Christ and have become partakers of the new divine life of Christ.

6,15-23: The Service of Righteousness.

Vv. 15-18

The second half of the chapter, which also forms a section by itself, begins the same way as the first. "What then? Shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace?" V.15. Does that follow from the statement presented previously in v.14? Does grace, our state of grace, give us license to sin? "God forbid!"

That is not so the Apostle proves again with an appeal to the Christian condition, which he now places under a different point of view. οὐκ οὔδατε, ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ θησκουετε; v. 16a. It is a generally accepted truth, well known to Christians, that one is his

servant to whom one gives or presents oneself in obedience. In the first part of the sentence the emphasis rests upon ὃ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ὑπακοήν, in the second part on δοῦλου. It would have been sufficient, if the Apostle had written: δοῦλου ἐστε αὐτοῦ "you are slaves of Him" or αὐτῷ "to Him." By expressing the concept of obedience also in the second part of the sentence, inserting ὃ ὑπακούετε for αὐτῷ, he strongly calls attention to the facts that obedience, also willing obedience always involves servitude. You are the servants of Him, to whom you belong, whom you obey, to whom you have become subject by your own choice. At first man had the freedom to choose a master for himself, whom he will obey. But when he has yielded himself into the service and obedience of this master, then this freedom ceases. He can no longer do what he wills, but must do what his master would have of him, and is bound to this master. Paul applies the general statement according to two sides, in malam partem "in evil parts" and in bonam partem "in good parts": You are servants, either of sin resulting in death, or of obedience resulting in righteousness". If one gives himself into the service of sin, then it soon follows that he is a servant of sin. He cannot make a halt on the way of sin, where he would, but must do everything that sin commands him, even things from which he first revolted. He is bound and chained to sin and cannot of himself release himself again from these bonds and chains. But the end of this way is death and condemnation or servants of obedience to righteousness, ἡ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην. Evidently here in contrast to sin, which is disobedience, obedience to God is meant. In this context the Apostle uses the expression ὑπακοή in various meanings. That is the other case, that one becomes obedient to obedience. That is a kind of paradox. The meaning is that this is the correct obedience when one obeys God, to whom every man owes obedience. Now when one presents oneself into the obedience of obedience, into the obedience of God, then he becomes a servant of obedience. Then in all factors he does what the obedience over against God demands of him, and remains in the bounds of obedience. He develops a firm, righteous character. He enters into the condition of righteousness, righteousness is his habitus (condition). Self-evidently under δικαιοσύνη "the righteousness of life" is to be understood. The Apostle here says nothing of the end of the way of obedience and righteousness. In vv.21-23 the twofold end of the twofold servitude, death and life, is expressly and independently mentioned. The εἰς θάνατον "in death" in v.16 is only an anticipation.

The latter of the two cases mentioned takes place among the Christians. The Apostle calls to his Christian readers: But thanks be to God, that you have become obedient from the heart and have become servants of righteousness. Those are the two principal concepts in the statement in v.17 and v.18. The Christians have experienced in themselves that freewill obedience changes into servitude, but on the good side, so that they owe God thanks for it. Certainly they have also had the experience of the servitude of sin. This wretched servitude lies in the past, for them, as they must acknowledge with thanks to God. They were servants of sin, but they are that no longer. In the sentence ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας "though you were slaves of sin" the ἦτε is stressed. Now they are obedient from the heart. The object of the obedience is here designated thus: εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς "to that form of teaching to which you were committed." The sentence is to be analyzed: ὑπακούσατε ἐκ καρδίας τῷ τύπῳ τῆς διδαχῆς, εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε . The Christian readers have become obedient to the form of doctrine. Τύπος διδαχῆς is the Christian doctrine, the evangelical truth of salvation in the form and stamp, as it was present in the preaching of Paul and in general in the preaching of the Apostle. This form of doctrine, which is effected and wrought by the Spirit of God Himself, is the standard form for all times. Obedience to the Christian doctrine and the correct form of doctrine is nothing else than faith. Faith is obedience to the Gospel. The Christians, with whom Paul deals here, have become believers. That was the beginning of their Christianity. This willing obedience of faith is certainly a gift of God, for which one must thank God. It also reads: εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε . The Christians have been given over into the Christian doctrine, naturally by God. God has modeled their hearts in the form of Christian doctrine. Or in other words: God has worked faith in them. Nevertheless, it has been a free, willing obedience. It is God who works even the willingness of faith. And the willing obedience has then drawn servitude after it. The statement in v.18, ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ "and having been freed from sin, you become slaves of righteousness," is, if not grammatically, yet logically dependent upon the ὅτι in v.17. It describes further the content of the expression of thanks. In that those who are now Christians have become obedient to the Gospel through the grace of God, they have become inwardly free from sin. They have thereby been reduced to servitude under righteousness and have become servants of righteousness. Believing Christians are bound to righteousness and cannot escape from that. Whoever is born of God cannot sin, cannot live in sin. 1 John 3,9. The new birth

does not permit that. If he sins, then he does not continue with the sin. He must again turn back immediately from the sin to the right track, into the service of righteousness. Righteousness has become a custom with him, like a second nature. It is a blessed subjection. The servitude of righteousness is true freedom. From what has been said it becomes evident how little the condition of the Christians, the condition of grace gives the freedom to sin.

VV.19-23

The Apostle here speaks (humanly), really ad hominem. V.19a. In the foregoing he made use of a strong physical manner of expression, in that he spoke of a servitude of righteousness, while otherwise the expression δουλεία, servitude, is used only malo sensu (in an evil sense). He did this because of the weakness of the flesh of his readers, not only because of their intellectual, but also because of their moral weakness. For the Gentile Christians were completely inclined to libertinism, in which they stood in danger of abusing the Christian freedom, as this comes forth out of all the Pauline Epistles. Cf. 5,13. Therefore Paul designated the condition of Christian freedom, the freedom from sin, for righteousness, at the same time as a condition of servitude of righteousness. Insofar as Christians still live in the flesh they should know that they have a Lord over them whom they must obey. In the following the Apostle continues this strong human manner of speech. The γάρ in v.19b is to be taken explicatively. Now he continues with an admonition, which presents itself out of the preceding description of the Christian condition. As in the first section of the chapter, 6,1-14, so also in this second part, 6,15-23, he adds to the reminder an expressive admonition. This modifies and strengthens the rejection of the question, which was brought forth in the introduction v.12a and v.15, whether we Christians should and may still sin.

The admonition now reads: ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτως νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν for just as you presented your members as slaves to impurity and, to lawlessness, resulting in further lawlessness, so now, present your members as slaves to righteousness, resulting in sanctification." That would say: Previously, when you were Gentiles and servants of sin, you placed your members to the disposition of sin, gave them into the service of uncleanness to fulfill iniquity, and did only what was not right before God. ἀκαθαρσία and ἀνομία, are designations of sin in general. Sin is ἀκαθαρσία, "uncleanness," corrupted body and soul, and it is ἀνομία, "iniquity," "illegality,"

in that they denied and broke the divine rule and law. But now, since you have become Christians and servants of righteousness, you have given your members to the service of righteousness, to the sanctification of the body and soul. The δικαιοσύνη is the opposite of ἀνομία, ἁγισμός is the opposite of ἀκαθαρσία. In their action and conduct the Christians should show what they are, as servants of righteousness, who are bound to righteousness, δουλωθέντες τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ.

The sentence structure in vv.20-23, joined by γάρ, serves, as the previous reminder, for the strengthening and foundation of this admonition. The Apostle turns to his Christians readers with the question: "For when you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. "Therefore what benefit were you then deriving from the things of which you are now ashamed"? Vv.20.21a. Previously you were servants of sin and free with regard to righteousness, ἐλεύθεροι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. You had absolutely nothing to do with righteousness, you were entirely incapable and incompetent to fulfill anything that was right before God. What fruit did you have at that time? καρπός meant the work and conduct of man, the product of the working of the mind, of the moral art and nature. What was thus the product of the servitude of sin? The answer reads: ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε "from the thing of which you are now ashamed," v.21b, such things of which you are now ashamed and must be ashamed, horrible vices, shameful pleasures, of which you must also be ashamed for this reason, because they finally bring only death and condemnation, τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος "For the end of those things is death." "But now having been freed from sin and enslaved to God, you derive you benefit, resulting in sanctification, and the outcome, eternal life." V.22. Now you have become free from the servitude of sin and have become servants of righteousness and thereby servants of God, really enslaved under God, δουλωθέντες τῷ θεῷ, then your fruit is inclined toward sanctification. The result of the servitude of God is a holy conduct and good works, which are pleasing to God and necessary and salutary for man. But the end of sanctification, of this service of righteousness is eternal life. The Apostle confirms that which was said with an axiom in v.23: τὰ γὰρ ὀφώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. "For the wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord". The wages which sin pays to all those who have been obedient and served it faithfully in this life is death. Death in the full sense of the word, physical death, but which for the servants of sin is only the gateway to eternal death. That this statement agrees

very well with what the Apostle taught in Ro 5,12ff. of the origin of death and the reign of death, we have proven above. Death is the wages, the deserved reward of sin. On the other hand, eternal life is a free, undeserved gift, a gracious gift of God, which is mediated and merited for us poor sinners by Christ Jesus, our Lord. Hell is always deserved, heaven never. At the same time, eternal life, even if it is a χάρισμα, is still the end, τέλος, of the way of sanctification. Sanctification is never a causa regnandi, but a via regni. God leads His own, whom He has justified and saved by grace upon this way of sanctification toward to their goal. It is very plain how that which the apostle carries out in this section, vv.20-23, motivates the foregoing admonition. The fatal results of the earlier servitude of sin must frighten the Christians away from sin. The blessed results of the present servitude of righteousness encourages to sanctification.

In the entire section, vv. 15-23, the Apostle considered and presented the servitude of sin as something which belongs to the past among the Christians. He summons the latter therefore to give thanks to God, because they have been freed from this servitude. This contains for the Christians not only an entreaty not to serve sin any more, but at the same time an earnest warning. Christians should know and well consider that they, when they misuse their Christian freedom and again acquiesce to sin, they also become servants of sin again and fall back into the former abominations of the heathen. Also, if they again serve sin, they have to expect nothing else than death and condemnation. Certainly, that is also a critical question, on which death and life, salvation and condemnation depend whether a Christian, after he is justified, whether a Christian, after he is justified, walks in sin and pursues sanctification.

The Summary of the Section, 6,15-23: The Apostle strengthens the former admonition henceforth no longer to serve sin, but God and righteousness. He reminds the Christians of the fact that the Servitude of sin has ceased for them and that they have now become servants of God and of righteousness. At the same time he points to the final end of the double service—death and eternal life.

CHAPTER 7

7:1-6: The Freedom from the Law

A new section evidently begins with the words in 7:1: "Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε ἀδελφοί, γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ, ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ; ", "Or do you not know, brethren (for I am speaking to those who know the law), that the law has jurisdiction over a person as long as he lives?" The favorite phrase of Paul, "do you not know," Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε , always as Godet correctly remarks, places the denial of the presented truth in contrast to an indisputable truth. How the indisputable fact serves that which was said previously we can judge correctly only after we have acquainted ourselves with the content of this new section, 7:1-6. The Apostle here offers instruction from the Law. He speaks to such who know the Law, γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ . He does not say: I speak to those among you who know the Law, that is, to the Jewish Christians. Then he would have had to write "to those knowing," τοῖς γινώσκουσιν , etc. There is no support in the text for the assumption that Paul addresses himself in this entire section exclusively to the Jewish Christian portion of the Roman congregation. The address, ἀδελφοί , applies here to all Christian readers of the Letter. All Christians, also the Gentile Christians, knew and know the Law, the revealed, Mosaic Law. The Old Testament was read in the Christian assemblies from the beginning. The apostolic preaching, as the Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of the Apostles prove, made the Old Testament its starting point throughout. The Law always was a part of the ecclesiastical publica doctrina (public doctrine). Thus the statement is also acknowledged by the Christians in general, because they know the Law: ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ . It is purely arbitrary, when Philippi takes the in an ethical meaning: "As long as man lives, that is, continues his old, natural life, he is a servant of the Law; only when he is spiritually dead is he free from the dominion of the Law." That is a thought that emerges only in the second half of the section, vv. 4-6, and is indicated by nothing in this verse. It is, as most of the commentators acknowledge, a general statement, an

axiom, which lies at the foundation of the entire Law and all its determinations, that the Law is master over man. It has the power and right to command man as long as he lives. The dominion of the Law extends over the entire span of life, but not beyond it. The demands of the Law apply to man who lives in the flesh and expire with death. There can be no more discussion of keeping or transgressing the Law after man is dead. When a man has died, he shall be rewarded accordingly as to his life. Then the Law is for God, the Judge, a measuring stick of judgment and of recompense. It hardly needs the remark that the Apostle here places himself solely on the standpoint of the Law and first of all omits entirely the change which Christ has brought.

The general statement that the application of the Law is broken off only by the death of man, but then completely by death, Paul proves and clarifies in vv. 2-3 by the example of the legal determination regarding marriage. The allegorical interpretation of this statement of the wife and the two husbands, which is found among ancient commentators and lately maintained especially by Philippi, is without any support in the text. Only from v. 4 on, there follows the allegorical application of the statement of the Law under discussion. The Mosaic marriage law includes the following points. A woman who is subject to the man, that is, "the married woman," ἡ ὑπανδρος γυνή is bound by the Law to the living man, that is, to the man as long as he lives. But when the man has died, then she is released from the law of the husband, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός, that is, "from the law which concerns the husband," that she should be the wife of this man and of no other. It says of the wife: "she is released from the law which concerns the husband," κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός. The κατήργηται really fits only the Law. The Law which concerns the husband, the marriage, is put away. It is abrogated and canceled for the wife, as soon as the husband has died. Through the death of the husband the wife has become free and unencumbered of that designation of the law, of her constraint to the husband. Out of the mentioned double determination (Ἄρα οὖν, v. 3) it follows, and this result makes the matter so much the more significant. When the wife is in the lifetime of the husband, "while the husband is living," ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός, belongs to another husband, "if she marries another man," εἰὼν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ, is called and adulteress, χρηματίσει. On the other hand, if her husband has died, she is freed from the law which had bound her to the husband, so that she is now no longer an adulteress, if she marries another husband. The verb χρηματίζειν designates really "to carry on affairs of state,"

then "to have a title of office," and in later Greek, simply "to be esteemed," "to have a name." The infinitive clause, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδά, γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ , gives, like all such infinitive clauses, not the result but the purpose: "so that she is not an adulteress though she is married to another man." That is the purpose of her freedom from the law, which lies in the divine ordinance of the Law, that after the death of her husband, she can marry again, without being guilty of adultery. In the example adduced now certainly the deceased and the person freed from the law by the death are different persons. The husband dies, and the wife is thus freed from the law. It is here presumed as self-understood, that first of all the husband, when he dies, is free and rid of the law which concerns marriage. But now the marriage law refers precisely to the relationship of the husband to the wife and of the wife to the husband. "Husband and wife here in their belonging to one another form the unique object of a legal determination, according to which the woman should be the wife of this and no other man, only as long as he lives." Hofmann. This speaks of a mutual obligation, and when such a mutual obligation becomes invalid for the one, then the other is free also. In the foregoing case, the fact that death releases all obligations of the Law, becomes apparent very concretely in a person still living, therefore the Apostle has well chosen this example. In this choice he had in mind already the allegorical application, which now follows in vv. 4-6.

That to which the Apostle would point with his instruction from the Law and concerning the Law in vv. 1-3, is shown in v. 4: ὥστε, ἀδελφοὶ μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι, ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ.

"Wherefore, my brethren, you also were made to die to the Law through the body of Christ; that you might be joined to another, to Him who was raised from the dead, that we might bear fruit for God." In short, the sense of these words is that through Christ's death we are released from the Law and now belong to Christ. That is a truth that transcends the Law, that first became known through the Gospel and that belongs to the Gospel. Thus this statement is no deduction from the preceding presentation in vv. 1-3. For the Law says nothing of Christ. From the teaching of the Law one can conclude nothing regarding Christ and His salvation. From the fact that the Law in its separate commandments speaks to man only as long as he lives, or from this that the wife is bound to the husband by the law only so long as the husband lives, it surely does not follow that the Christians

through Christ are now completely released from the Law. But the ὥστε, with which the statement in v. 4 is introduced, is also originally not a particle of inference. ὥστε is made up of ὡς and τε and originally and throughout in the ancient profane Greek means "as," "even as." From this then the consecutive significance "consequently," and "so that" developed, insofar as that which follows from a premise has a similarity with this premise. In this text only the "agreement" is thereby shown, 'with which the following joins itself to the preceding.'" (Hofmann) We translate it best of all with "accordingly," "correspondingly," or like Hofmann, with "and so." Luther with his translation: "thus also, my brethren" has expressed it correctly. There is a similarity between vv. 1-3 and v. 4, and the latter is illustrated by the former. The general statement, v. 1, that death removes the obligation of the Law for every man, corresponds to the fact that Christ's death has entered in, and that this death has put an end to all obligation of the entire Law. And to the example offered of the wife and the two husbands corresponds the fact that those who are now Christians first belonged to the Law as their lawful spouse, had been bound to the Law. Now through Christ's death, they are released from the Law and belong to another as their lawful spouse, namely, Christ, the risen One. That is the tertium comparationis (the point of comparison). One must not go beyond this and dare not, in general, press the image. We now examine the constituent parts of the foregoing statement more closely: "Therefore, you also were made to die to the Law through the body of Christ," ὥστε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This the Apostle gives the Christians to consider. The Christians, like the wife to the husband, are dead to the Law, and this through the body of Christ, who was put to death on the cross. Christ has been put to death according to the flesh and has with His powerful, bloody death paid the final tribute to the Law. Thereby he has put an end to the Law, has put the Law out of power and effect, both in its demands and as well as in its threats. Cf. Eph 2:15: ἐν τῷ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας, "by abolishing in his flesh the enmity, which is the law of commandments contained in ordinances." By His death Christ has first of all redeemed us from the curse of the Law, but then also from the dominion and power of the Law. And now through Baptism and faith, as the Apostle had previously brought into remembrance, we Christians have become partakers of the death of Christ, of the fruit of His death, of His redemption. Thus we are delivered, free, unencumbered of the Law, precisely from the dominion, from the jurisdiction and coercion of the Law. For in this connection it treats of the "dominion," κυριότης of the Law.

The Law is no more lord over us. The former relationship to the Law, that we are subject to the Law, like the wife to the husband, is completely and eternally dissolved. We are dead to the Law, and we have nothing more to do with the Law and the Law nothing more to do with us. What Paul writes here applies to all Christians. If he has the Jewish Christians in mind, first of all, who had formerly lived under the Law, he, nevertheless does not wish to exclude the Gentile Christians. The Law, and even the revealed Mosaic Law, as far as it is a moral Law, is meant for all men. It places before all mankind, to whom it applies, the demand that they subject themselves to it. The Gentile Christians are not, just because they are Gentiles, but because they are Christians, delivered and free from the Law only through Christ. To the Law you are dead, "that you might be married to another, to Him who was raised from the dead," εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἐτέρῳ τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι . Thus the Apostle continues. Through baptism and faith the Christians are bound to Christ, the crucified and risen One. As the wife to the husband are joined to Christ, who has risen from the dead and lives eternally. The risen and living Christ, after the Law has been put away through the death of Christ, is now our legal spouse and husband. He alone has the power and right to speak to us as a husband. And it is the purpose of this relationship to Christ, that we should bring fruit to God, "that we might bear fruit for God," ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ , as is also done. The fruits of good works understood, are done in love and honor to God. Here, as everywhere the good works of the Christian are called fruit, the picture is that of the harvest of the fields and the fruits of the trees. To interpret the καρποφορεῖν "to bear fruit" as "fruit of marriage," καρπὸν κοιλίας, is to press the picture of the marriage improperly. Such changing of person, as we meet it in this verse, ἐθανατώθητε-ὑμᾶς-καρποφορήσωμεν - is found frequently with Paul. The address ἀδελφοί μου fits very well to the content of the foregoing statement. The Apostle, who confessed and boasted of himself in Ga 2:19: "For through the Law I died to the Law, that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ," feels himself closely attached to the Christians from among the Jews and Gentiles. The Christians, in a similar manner, have escaped from the Law and belong only to Christ and to God, as his beloved brethren, his spiritual relatives. ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ. νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατευχόμεθα, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος.

"For while we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were aroused by the Law, were at work in the members of our body to bear fruit for death. But now we have been released from the Law, having died so that by which we were bound; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter" vv. 5-6. This double statement evidently joins itself to the immediately preceding statement of purpose, ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ . For also in v. 5 is found the expression καρποφορεῖν , and with the "serve in newness of spirit" certainly nothing else is meant than the fruit of good works. Thus the statements in vv. 5-6 introduced with γάρ serve the sentence that we should now bring fruit unto God, not so much as proof, but as clarification. With the words ὅτε ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί the Apostle reminds the Christians, first of all, of their condition before they became Christians. Before they became Christians they were in the flesh, where their entire being was enclosed and confined in the old corrupt nature. Paul includes himself here with all Christians from among the Jews and Gentiles, who previously had walked according to the flesh and had served sin. He omits the fact that there were also Jewish Christians who before their Baptism had been believing Israelites and had been born anew through faith in the promise. Nevertheless the being in the "flesh" is the condition into which every person is born. That we were in the flesh brought with it the fact that the sinful passions were active in our members. The expression παθήματα designates exactly that which we call "passions." Πάθημα is used of the effects and tempers of the human heart and is in itself vox media (the voice of means). But in later Greek under the παθήματα there are always "to be understood the objectionable effects and impulses under whose dominion man conducts himself indifferently." (Cremer) That is the sense of the word in our passage and in the second passages in the New Testament where it is also present, Ga 5:24: οὗ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις, "Now those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires." πάθη ἀτιμίας "shameful passions," Ro 1:26 τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν are the emotions which work themselves out in sins, in acts of sins. These emotions were active, ἐνηργεῖτο , in our members, in that the members of the body carried the evil impulses and effects into fulfillment. The emphasis, however, now lies on the modifier of παθήματα , on τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου . For Paul in this entire context calls attention to the great benefit, that we are freed from the Law. The emotions were transferred through the Law and were stirred up by the Law. That fact the Apostle develops more fully in the new section. Thus in carnal man the Law only promotes sin. There is still to be said here what Weiss remarks: "By

this modifier it is pointed out that the παθήματα characteristic of the life of the flesh, were active everywhere in the pre-Christian condition. They were not eliminated by the life under the Law, but could only be promoted. But in no way were these passions aroused also among the Gentile Christians, who had, in fact, not yet been under the Law. Therefore Paul does not write simply διὰ τοῦ νόμου, but only designates the παθήματα as such which have the characteristic to be aroused by the Law." One must add the fact that in the time before Christ the Law of Moses had become known to many Gentiles, as it is now known in the whole world. These Gentiles then had entirely the same experience with the Law as the Jews. And finally Philippi's remarks, concerning the law of conscience also apply, "which the Gentiles possessed as a substitute for the Mosaic Law." This "radiation from the divine, revealed Law," aroused the lusts of the flesh. To what end the sinful passions were directed in the last analysis is stated in the addition εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ, that we should bring forth fruit unto death. Here also the εἰς shows not the result, but only the purpose. That was the inclination, as it were, the tendency of the passions, to work themselves out through the members of the body in acts of sin and thus to bring forth evil, wicked fruit, shameful works, which finally work death and condemnation. Cf. 6:21-23. The Apostle James describes the same process of evil, 1:15: "Then when lust has conceived, it gives birth to sin: and when sin is accomplished, it brings forth death." And now in that the Law arouses the evil lusts, it also helps man to death.

The backward glance into the past should place the presence of the Christians into a much brighter light. "But now," so it reads further in v. 6, but now a change has taken place, since we became Christians. But now "we are delivered from the law," κατηργήθημεν, have become free and unencumbered of the Law, which only helped to sin and death. The Apostle repeats emphatically, only in other words, what he had said previously, v. 4a, and here adds the modifier: ἀποθάνοντες ἐν ᾧ κατευχόμεθα. Behind ἀποθάνοντες - for that is more acceptable and the only reading that fits into the context, not (τοῦ θανάτου) "of death," - τούτῳ or ἐκείνῳ is to be supplied. Thus we have to translate: "having died that by which we were bound." That wherein we were held as in a prison is, according to the context, the flesh. For of the flesh it had been said in v. 5, that our entire being had been contained therein. The being in the flesh brought with it the fact that the Law made the passions active and thus compelled and enslaved us under sin. And in that we are now dead to the flesh, we are now also delivered from the Law, from the distressing dominion of the Law.

In that we are dead to the sinful flesh, to sin, we are dead to the Law. "It has become a liberating death out of the compulsion and jurisdiction of the inborn nature, wherein the deliverance from the Law completes itself." Thus Schott, Hofmann, Weiss and Luthardt in our judgment correctly explain the participial clause. When one, like most commentators, understands the Law as that under which we were held, then there is a pure autology. For to be delivered from the Law and to be dead to the Law are one and the same thing, and the parallelism with v. 5, where the tyranny of the Law is coupled with the being in the flesh, is lost. But in v. 6 the conclusion has the emphasis: ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος , "so that we serve in newness of the Spirit and not in oldness of the letter." For in contrast to the previous condition under sin and the Law this characterizes the present condition of the Christian, which results from the deliverance from the flesh and the Law. It describes the present, the fruit-bearing of the Christian. Since we have been delivered from the flesh and the Law, therefore we now, self-evidently, serve God in newness of spirit. The ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος gives the "sphere of activity of the δουλεύειν." Καινότης is here meant concretely, designates the new condition and situation in which the Christian finds himself, the new essence and life in which he moves and lives. That is the "new essence of the spirit." This new essence and life is engendered by the Spirit of God and is ruled and governed by the Spirit of God, who is in the Christians. Or, in other words, we add the statement in v. 4b: It is the risen, living Christ, who works, works all good, brings forth glorious fruit through the Spirit in the Christians, who have become partakers of His resurrection-life. And this fruit of the Spirit is the real God-pleasing worship. This service, this worship excludes entirely the other service, the δουλεύειν ἐν παλαιότητι γράμματος , "and not in oldness of the letter." That which the Christians deny is that they serve in the old sinful essence, which is only subjected to the outward letter of the Law. Man has before and over himself only the strong demands of the Law, which give no power for good, but which rather only arouse the sinful lusts. What the Apostle here describes regarding the essence of the condition of the Christian is also really the habitus (attitude) of the Christian, which is not dissolved by the daily sins of weakness, which are put away in daily repentance and contrition. Weiss still remarks on the expression γράμμα : "That γράμμα designates the Mosaic Law and only this is undoubted. But how it should follow that Paul includes himself with the Jewish Christians is hard to understand here. He does not say that the παλαιότης γράμματος had been their

common, former condition. But he says only that their common deliverance from the Law would have prevented, that for them all only the παλαιότης γραμματος, that is, this form of the old sinful life would come into existence. This he learned to know in his time under the law and this would enter in among them all, if they would be placed under the Law, which must happen inevitably without this κατηγορήθην.

Thus we Christians, because we are redeemed by Christ and have become partakers of His redemption through faith and Baptism, are also free and released from the Law, not only from the curse of the Law, but also from the dominion and binding force of the Law. The Law, even the revealed, written Law, is no longer our κύριος "Lord." The Law has nothing more to say to us, we are no longer bound by the Law. (You Christians are dead to the Law, that is, the Law is dead for you, or, since it no longer dominates you, urges or compels you... neither are you now obligated under it). Vos christiani estis mortificati legi, hoc est, lex est vobis mortua, vel quae non amplius vobis dominatur, urget et cogit vos... neque estis ei nunc obligati. Koerner. That the Apostle attests as apodictically as possible in the section, Ro 7:1-6. And we should guard ourselves well that we do not limit or reduce this precious evangelical truth. Above all, we Christians are not sovereign and our own will is not suprema lex (the highest law) for us. We are free, but free in God. We live to God, we serve God, we bring fruit to God. We are subject to God and are bound as creatures of God, also as new creatures, in the unchangeable will of God. But when we undertake to fulfill the will of God, then the most important question for us is not: What does the Law demand of us?, but: What is well-pleasing to Christ, my Lord and Redeemer and Bridegroom? What is pleasing to my God, to the God who is reconciled to me through Christ? How and by what means can I best serve my beloved heavenly Father? And this question answers itself. The Holy Spirit, who is in us, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of God teaches us to do according to God's good pleasure and leads us along a pleasant way, creates in us a desire for and a bringing forth of the good. These good works, which the Holy Spirit brings forth out of the believers, are identical with the works of which the Law speaks. The mind and will of the Spirit of God, who teaches, moves, leads, and rules us inwardly, is identical with the unchangeable will of God, which has also found expression in the Law of God. But the works of the believers are therefore in no way works of the Law but fruits of the Spirit. A Christian does not reflect upon his being and not being in this manner: I will make every effort to fulfill all the strict demands of the Law as precisely and minutely as possible, but

without much reflection. The good works flow forth out of his heart, by the power and influence of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine of the Christian freedom as a freedom from the Law does not make us antinomians, does not contradict that which the Formula of Concord emphasizes in Art VI: de tertio usu legis (the third use of the law). The Law, "the written Law," is and remains "a definite rule and standard of a blessed life and conduct," especially for believing, regenerated Christians, and only for them. Unconverted men cannot walk according to this rule. To them the Law must first of all serve as a mirror, in which they can recognize their sins. But there one must distinguish carefully. Therefore the believing Christians still need the rule of the Law, because they still bear in themselves their sinful flesh, not insofar as they are Christians and regenerated. Our Confession elaborates on that. "And, indeed, if the believing and elect children of God were completely renewed in this life by the indwelling Spirit, so that in their nature and all its powers they were entirely free from sin, they would need no law. Hence no one needs to drive them either, but they would do of themselves, and altogether voluntarily, without any instruction, admonition, urging or driving of the Law, what they are in duty bound to do according to God's will. As the sun, the moon, and all the constellations of heaven have their regular course of themselves, unobstructed, without admonition, urging, force or compulsion, according to the order of God which God once appointed for them, yes, just as the holy angels an entirely voluntary obedience." (Trig., p. 963). But because "to the believing, elect, and regenerated children of God" "in this life the old Adam still always clings," therefore "they need the daily instruction and admonition, warning and threatening of the Law." Because they still are burdened with much error and foolishness, which is a part of the sinful flesh, because they so easily "serve God according to their own thoughts," therefore they also still need the daily instruction of the Law, so that they learn from the Ten Commandments which are the real, God-pleasing works. On the other hand, so far as man is born anew by the Spirit of God, he is taught by God and "does everything from a free, cheerful spirit; and these are called not properly works of the Law, but works and fruits of the Spirit, or as St. Paul names it, 'the law of the mind' and 'the law of Christ.'" For such men are no more under the Law, but under grace, as St. Paul says, Ro 8:2 (Ro 7:23); 1 Cor 9:21.' (Trig., p. 867)

When we finally compare very briefly the two sections 6:13-23 and 7:1-6, in order to understand how they relate, we become aware of a striking similarity. In the first the Apostle shows the Christians that they are free from sin, from

the servitude of sin, in the latter that they are delivered from the Law, from the dominion of the Law. In the first he shows the Christians that they are now in servitude under God, in the latter that they are bound to Christ as their Bridegroom. In both he points to death as the end of the service of sin. In 7:1-6 he likewise calls special attention to the fact that the Law promoted sin, as well as that we, in that we died to the sinful flesh and are released from the Law. Thus he shows the connection between sin and the Law, between freedom from sin and freedom from the Law. Thus this latter explanation serves for the confirmation of the foregoing in 6:13-23, and establishes together with the latter the admonition, 6:19, to serve righteousness. Correctly one has also called attention to the fact that here the short statement in 6:14-15, that the Christians are not under the Law, is more clearly explained and developed. We can accordingly summarize this first section of the seventh chapter in the statement:

In order to further establish his previous admonition, the Apostle reminds the Christians of the fact that they are delivered from the Law through the death of Christ and now belong to Christ, the risen One, and are governed by His Spirit.

7:7-12: The Purpose and Effect of the Law.

In the previous section the Apostle had attested two things to the Christians, first, that they, since they became Christians, have been delivered from sin, and then, that they have been delivered from the Law. Thus he had compared with one another the freedom from the servitude of sin and freedom from the servitude of the Law. From that it appears to follow: "What shall we say then? Is the law sin?" ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία ; v. 7a. The meaning of the question is not whether the Law is identical with sin, as, for example, Hofmann and Luthardt would have it. That would be an absolutely absurd statement, which also is not explained or excused by the fact that one says the questioners would reproach the Apostle that his foregoing explanation comes out to an absurdity. The words ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία ; also do not signify whether the Law is the originator of sin, but only whether the Law is sinful, "in itself something evil and consequently something harmful" (Godet). That would be the case, if the Law demanded something sinful, evil from man. The interpretation of ἁμαρτία in the sense of ἁμαρτολός , abstractum pro concreto (the thought exists before the fact), is also confirmed by the contrast ὁ νόμος ἅγιος , "the Law is holy," v. 12. The Apostle rejects to that deduction energetically with Μὴ γένοιτο "may it not be." But if he then continues with ἀλλὰ , then he does not introduce a contrast,

but a declaration which limits the denial that the Law is sin. With Luther, Fritzsche, DeWette, Weiss, Godet and Luthardt we translate the ἀλλὰ with "but," "but still." The meaning is: The Law is not sin, not in itself evil and sinful, but indeed it has something to do with sin, it stands in a certain relation to sin. And it is now the purpose of the Apostle to determine exactly the actual relationship of the Law to sin.

And the first thing which he now says concerning this is: τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων, εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις "I would not have come to know sin except through the Law; for I would not have known about coveting the Law had not said 'You shall not covet.'" He speaks here, as in the following, with "I." What he says of himself is a general truth and it applies to every man who comes into contact with the Law. Here Paul chooses this form of instruction, so that he might illustrate what he would teach concerning the effects of the Law in his own experience. Modern expositors, like Hofmann, Weiss, Luthardt and Meyer, understand this statement thus, that the Apostle had learned to know by experience by means of the Law the sin which had at first remained strange to him in reference to his own personal life. With him the awakening of the lust had been the first vision of a spontaneous sinful conduct. But omitting the fact that a difference of that kind of natural sin and personal evil conduct is otherwise foreign to the Scriptures, in our passage ἔγνων, where it alternates with ᾔδειν, evidently designates a simple knowing, cognoscere (to get to know), What the Apostle says of himself, that he had learned to know sin by the Law, is exactly the same thing that he had presented in 3:20 as a common axiom: "By the law is the knowledge of sin."

Thus the Formula of Concord states:

[Everything that reproves sin is and belongs to the Law, whose peculiar office it is to reprove sin and to lead to the knowledge of sins. Ro 3:20 and 7:7] (Triglotta, p. 957).

And in the same sense Ro 7:7 has been understood by most of the ancient expositors, and among the more recent especially, Philippi and Godet. Man errs and sins from his birth on and sees in that which he has perverted and done evil a natural weakness, an easily pardonable mistake. Only when the Law comes upon him does he really recognize the sin as what it is, as conduct displeasing to God, as opposition against the will of God. Paul makes that clear by an example, by the Commandment which forbids covetousness. "I would not have known about coveting if the law had not said: You shall not covet." We take the τε, to which no second τε corresponds, as a weakened του, (A.V. "Nay"). With

ἐπιθυμία Paul means, as otherwise throughout, precisely the same ἐπιθυμεῖν which is forbidden in the Law, the same which he had shortly before called in v. 5: τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν "the passions of sin," thus the evil lust. From a child on there reign in the hearts of men all sorts of lusts and evil desires. The natural man regards these lusts as an impulse of nature, and considers it very natural to give way to such impulse when the Law is known to him and says to him: "You shall not covet." When the Law forbids and denies him that for which he covets, then he recognizes the lust as that which it is, as a desire displeasing to God. Then he knows that the wishes, desires, thoughts and endeavors of his heart go contrary to God and His will.

When the Apostle continues in v. 8: "But sin, taking opportunity through the commandment, produced in me coveting of every kind," Ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατεργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν then by means of the metabatic δέ he adds to the previous statement a second expression concerning the relationship of the Law to sin. The emphasis here lies on the κατεργάσατο . The Law serves not only for the knowledge of sin, of the evil lust, but also contributes that the evil lust comes to pass. The Law also promotes and increases sin. What was expressed briefly in the statement in 5:20: "And the law came in that the transgression might increase," is now further developed in the expression in 7:5: "the passions of sin by the Law," τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου "the sinful passions which were stirred up by the law." One cannot better characterize the development from v. 7 to vv. 8-9, the connection of the two statements, than with the words of Luther, in which he gives the exegesis on Ga 3:19: "When sin is revealed to a man through the Law, death, wrath and judgment of God, hell, etc., then it is impossible that he does not become impatient, does not murmur, does not hate God and His will." "Now, however, when sin and death are revealed, he wishes that there were no God. Therefore the Law occasions the fact that one hates God most of all. That means not only that one sees and recognizes sin through the Law, but also that through this recognition of sin the sin is increased, kindled, irritated and made great."

Nevertheless, when the Scriptures speak thus, that the Law increases sin, that the passions are aggravated by the Law, then the meaning is not as if the Law in itself brought about such evil effects. But it is thereby presumed that it is the sinful, fleshly man with whom the Law has to deal. It is basically the sinful flesh, which, when it is attacked by the Law, brings forth evil thoughts, desires, and consequently also evil works. Only per accidens (by accident), as our fathers said, only in connection with the flesh and sin, does the Law increase

and kindle sin. Thus we read in 7:5, that, when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were set in motion by the Law, became active in our members. And in our passage the Apostle expresses himself so, that sin, in that it took occasion in the Commandment, worked every evil lust in him. Sin is the real subjectum agens (acting subject) the real causa efficiens (the efficient cause) of evil lust, which makes the Law subject to its purpose. In that he gives his discussion this turn, Paul intentionally excludes that false notion, as if the Law itself were evil and in and by itself worked evil. But what does he mean here by sin which is caused by lust? Elsewhere, as in James 1:15, the Scriptures attest that lust, when it has conceived, brings forth sin. There ἁμαρτία designates the actual sin. In our passage it reads just the opposite, that sin brings forth lust. There under ἁμαρτία he evidently understands the source and root of all evil, which are themselves evil. The expositors define ἁμαρτία, as it is used in 7:8, as "potential of sin" or "principle of sin;" or "inclination" or "impetus to sin," or "depravation of nature," or malitia naturalis, (natural wickedness) or "original sin," etc. It is "sin which dwells in me," ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. 7:17-20, the sin dwelling in man; we rather say: The natural, perverted, God-displeasing tendency of the mind and will of man. This then begets evil thoughts, wishes, desires, and finally also evil acts. But now it is the Law, and therein lies the emphasis in our passage, which gives occasion and opportunity to sin to work all evil desires, or rather: sin, in that it works evil lusts, takes occasion in the Commandment. Thus with Philippi and others we take the expression: "taking opportunity by the commandment," ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. Most expositors separate διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς from ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα and combine it with κατεργάσατο and translate thus: "in that sin took occasion, it has worked every lust in me." To be sure, the Greek always says ἀφορμὴν λαμβάνειν ἀπὸ τινος or παρὰ τινος. But some prepositional modifier is absolutely necessary, if ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα is supposed to have a meaning in general. It must be noted what the object is to which the commandment gives occasion. And since the Apostle otherwise expresses himself in this manner, that by the Law the passions are made active, 7:5, or that sin kills by the Law, 7:11, and thus the expression, that sin works lust by the Commandment, lies very close to him. Therefore we properly accept the fact that here he blends into one the two forms of speech, which finally present the same sense, namely, "taking opportunity from the commandment achieved," ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα ἀπὸ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατεργάσατο and διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατεργάσατο and has combined the

διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς with ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα as the necessary supplement. Koerner remarks on the matter:

(Sin took occasion through the Law, that is, damned by the voice of the law, κατεργάσατο , it; effected, it begot, it kindled πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν , every lust the more in me. This it causes not only in me, but in any person; not regenerated, so that lust was more inflamed when it heard the prohibition, and soared and strained more vehemently against God in the thing forbidden. But this is not caused by a defect of the Law, but by the malice of the depraved nature or the sin dwelling in us. This is actually said to be - in the likeness of time: it is kindled quickly when water is sprinkled on it, but is extinguished by oil).

[Peccatum accepta occasione per legem, hoc est, voce legis damnatum κατεργάσατο , effecit, genuit, accendit in me magis πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν, omnem concupiscentium; idque in me non tantum, sed in quolibet non renato effecit, ut concupiscentia magis inflammetur audita prohibitione, et vehementius adversus Deum fremat et nitatur in vetitum; quod non tam vitio legis, quam malitia depravatae naturae, aut peccati in nobis habitantis efficitur; quod solet declarari similitudine de calce, quae viva accenditur aspersa aqua, oleo vero restinguitur. Ita peccatum lege augeri, evangelio autem minui dicitur.]

And Godet writes:

"It treats here with that well-known experience already alluded to by the ancients, that man always inclines to the forbidden fruit. Cp. Pr 9:17. The prohibition has the effect of firmly fixing the object in the imagination and thereby investing it with a new attraction. The heart is as bewitched by it and the dormant yearning is changed into an intensive desire. Thus, so to speak, every word of the Commandment has the characteristic that it awakens a new lust in the heart. But it is well to consider that that happens so, only because sin, the selfish impulse, already exists in the heart. The Commandment itself does not bring forth this effect. Sin, so to speak, exploits the Commandment for this purpose."

The Apostle himself in the following explains how far sin by means of the Commandment brings all evil lust to pass.

It reads further: "For apart from the Law sin is dead. And I was once alive apart from the Law but when the commandment came, sin became alive " vv. 8b-9. These three sentences are closely joined together. The first two form the setting for the third, which has the emphasis. Without the Law sin is dead. This Paul had also experienced in his time, when he lived without the Law. But when the Commandment came, sin revived in him. That is an experience which all men have with the Law. When the Law comes, sin revives and becomes powerful, efficacious, works all sorts of evil lusts and desires. That is, in short, the nexus rerum (joining together of things). That also with the νόμος , "law" without the article, the Mosaic Law is meant in the doubled "without the Law," χωρὶς νόμος as it does so often otherwise. Some exegetes doubt this as it is shown by the context, in vv. 7-12, which would give instruction concerning the revealed Law, and in which "the Law," ὁ νόμος ,

"Law" νόμος and "the commandment" ἡ ἐντολή are interchanged with one another. In that we now inspect the three-membered statement more closely in its individual parts, the question arises at the very beginning: What time does the Apostle have in mind when he writes in v. 9a: ἐγὼ δὲ ἔξων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ "And I was then living without law." This question, however, joins closely together with the other: How are these words to be construed and what does ἔξων signify here. Most expositors place ἐγὼ δὲ ἔξων in contrast to ἁμαρτία νεκρά "sin is dead," v. 8, as well as to Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον "And I died," v. 10. They take ἔξων pregnantly as an independent concept synonymous with: "I was alive," and χωρὶς νόμου as a virtual subordinate sentence, in the sense: "when I was without the law." And older exegetes, like Flacius and Calov, designate as the time when Paul was without the Law as his time of being a Pharisee. Then he had not yet felt the prick of the Law. He had still not correctly known and felt sin, since he had been alive according to his own, indeed, erroneous thought, He had stood in the delusion that he was righteous and acceptable before God and already in possession of life eternal. But it is absolutely unbelievable that Paul should have characterized his time of being a Pharisee, in which he by all his powers strove after the righteousness of the Law, in which he was really under the Law, as a life, a condition sine lege (without the law) and extra legem (in addition to the law). Most modern exegetes refer the ἐγὼ δὲ ἔξων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ to the early childhood of Paul. But then, like Meyer, Weiss, and Godet, they paint the same with colors, which they take from their imagination and not from actual facts. They take it as "the death-free life of childlike innocence," as a "condition of life similar to the condition in Paradise of the first parents," as a "real beginning of the life in God, a pure flame, which without doubt was afterward stifled by his own righteousness." The Scripture knows nothing of such a heavenly condition in the life of the children of men, who are conceived and born in sin. We agree with the point, that Paul here looks back into the time of his early childhood, of his minority. But we understand his statement simply that he once, when he was still a child and not of age, lived without the Law, lived his life, so that there was for him a time, when sin was dead. We do not pack everything possible into ἔξων, but rather lay the stress on χωρὶς νόμου, and take this, the same as the ποτέ placed at the end, as a modifier to ἔξων. If χωρὶς νόμου were meant as a subordinate sentence, then ποτέ would have to follow immediately after ἔξων, to which it belongs in any case. The intended contrast between death and life lies in the ἁμαρτία νεκρά, v. 9b. Thus Origen already understood the expression of Paul, in that he adds in

explanation: πᾶς γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἔξη χωρὶς νόμου ποτε, ὅτε παιδίον ᾗν

"For each man then was living without the law, when he was a child." In his early childhood man lives without the Law, in that he does not yet know the Law or is not properly aware of its content and meaning. We can add, that men, who only in later life learn God's Word and Law, also in their more mature years lived in a certain sense without the Law, and sinned in their ignorance. But then one must take into consideration, that with all men, when they enter into the anni discretionis (the year of discretion), that the natural law and the conscience exercise a function, similar to the revealed Law. After the Law-less period there followed for Paul a time "when the commandment came," ἐλθούσης τῆς ἐντολῆς , especially the Commandment, "You shall not covet," became known to him, and entered into his consciousness. That was the time of his spiritual maturity, when he came into the full use of his reason. And then sin which had previously been dead was revived. Thus with most expositors we translate the ἀνέζησεν , and not revived again. In many compositis (compositions) the preposition ἀνά signifies only up, "up to." Thus ἀναβλαστάνω means "sprout, spring up" ἀναζέω , "boil up," ἀναβλέπω , "look up." Thus in the time, when Paul as a Pharisee stood and lived under the Law, was zealous for the Law, and wanted to become righteous by the works of the Law, sin, the evil lust, was at the same time alive in him. The one does not exclude the other.

What the Apostle thus emphasizes in vv. 8b-8 is, taken as a general axiom, that sin is dead, as long as man lives without the Law, but that sin revives when the Law enters. We must still clarify for ourselves, what this being dead and this reviving of sin through the Law includes. Especially in earlier times, the being dead of sin one has, has often been interpreted in this sense that without the Law sin remained unknown and unrecognized to man, likewise did not terrify and cause anxiety to his conscience. Certainly man did not know sin according to its real essence, likewise knew nothing of evil lust, as long as the Law was strange to him. But the Apostle had already called special attention to that fact in v. 7b. The expression which he now uses, "without the Law sin is dead," χωρὶς νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά states more. Fritzsche remarks very correctly to that: Imo hoc dicit: nam ita res comparata est, ut sine Mosis lege peccato vita et vis et nervi desint (Finally this says: the bottom line is this: without the Law of Moses sin lacks life and strength and muscles). Without the Law sin lacks the real power of life, the real nerve of life. Sin dwells in man from birth and also does not rest there as a dormant seed in the field of the heart; this is not the tertium comparationis (the point of comparison), but makes itself felt and infects and penetrates all the motions of life, even of the little child.

As long as he is not regenerated, man, who is conceived and born in sin, errs and sins from his birth, with all his wishes and desires, even with all his unconscious and thoughtless deeds and omissions. But the real vis peccati (power of sin), the nervus peccati (strength of sin) first sleeps and becomes active and begins to develop when the Law enters. This nerve of the life of sin is the conscious opposition against God and His will. When the Law enters into the knowledge and consciousness of man, then only man recognizes sin as that which it is, as a God-displeasing conduct. From that it follows, that sin becomes alive and strong in him and shows itself powerfully, as that which it is, as enmity against God. In the above quotation Luther emphasizes that "through this showing forth of sin, sin is increased, kindled and magnified," in that now with every power and energy it opposes the Law of God. The Law and the showing forth of sin "brings it about," "that man murmurs, hates God and His will, and wishes that there were no God." The Law, every Commandment, and so also especially the Commandment which forbids lust, opposes the natural sinful impulses and strivings of man. Then the result is, that sin starts up in anger and foams up like a stream. It at first flows quietly, but then foams up and swells when a dam is put into its course. Sin holds the mind and inclination of man fast to the forbidden object, to the forbidden fruit and urges him on to stand firmly against the prohibition. Sin stirs man up against God, so that man murmurs against God and hates God, because He has given such a disagreeable Commandment, and has denied him that after which his heart lusts. Man wishes that there were no Law, that there were no God. Thus, sin directs and urges man to bid God defiance and to overstep the bounds established by God and works in him every lust, an intensive desire, urging and seeking for all the things which God has forbidden and barred to him. In the end it makes no difference, sin has accomplished its will and attained its purpose by means of the Law. This happens whether man now satisfies his desires, whether the evil lust in every case also bear the evil deed, or whether man, moved by outward considerations, holds himself within certain bounds and displays an outward pharisaical righteousness, in which the wildest lusts nevertheless rage and move unhindered in the heart.

By means of the $\delta\epsilon\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ the Apostle adds a further statement to the previous one, concerning the relationship of the Law to sin: "And I died. And this commandment, which was to result in life, proved to result in death for me. For sin, taking opportunity through the commandment, deceived me, and through it killed me " vv. 10-11. The Law caused the Apostle's death, as it causes all men death. That is the immediate sense of these words. It is a third

effect of the Law. The Apostle has already previously pointed to death repeatedly. Death is the end of the servitude of sin. 6:21. Death is the wages of sin. 6:23. When we were in the flesh, the sinful passions were active in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. 7:5. In the latter passage, however, it was also already emphasized that these passions, which finally brought about death, were active through the Law. Sin works death, and insofar as the Law serves sin, it also serves death. The Law, every single Commandment includes in itself the statement: "So you shall keep My statutes and My judgments, by which a man may live if he does them." Lv. 18:5. "Do this, and you will live." Luke 10:28. But in reality even the Commandment, which is to life, is "the commandment which was for life," ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν according to that which was explained previously, was found as tending toward death, εὐρέθη εἰς θάνατον. In that the Law makes sin known and reveals it as transgression, it also shows the punishment of sin which is death. It is an essential component of the Law: "Cursed is he who does not confirm the words of this law by doing them," Dt 27:26. And in that Law, the Commandment increases and augments sin, works every evil lust, it also tends to death. Under θάνατος we understand here, as everywhere where the expression has been used previously in the Letter, death in the fullest sense of the word, which is the physical death, which draws after itself eternal death, hell and condemnation for the sinner. The foregoing statement is essentially identical with the sentence: "The law works wrath" 4:15. And when the Apostle now writes: Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον "and I died," he speaks of a dying, of an experience of death in the lifetime. Then he would say nothing else than that man, as soon as the Law enters into his consciousness, convinces him of sin and transgression, and makes sin, the evil lust, alive in him. He also begins to feel and discover something of the terror of death, of hell and of condemnation. But it also applies here that the Law in itself and by itself does not work such evil effect, but only per accidens (by accident), in connection with sin. The sin which dwells in man is basically that which puts man to death even by means of the Law. "For sin, taking opportunity through the commandment, deceived me, and through it killed me." ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. These words serve for a closer explanation of the preceding statement regarding the Law. Sin places before the eyes of man the forbidden things, joy and pleasures, like the serpent placed the forbidden fruit before the eyes of the woman, as desirable gain. But that is deceit; for the forbidden fruit hides death and condemnation in itself. Sin now under such misrepresentation turns the heart and mind of man to such things, and thereby holds them firmly,

concerning which the Commandment speaks "You shall not covet," (from which the Commandment would restrain man.) It brings death and condemnation to man by means of the Commandment.

ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή "So then, the Law is holy, and the commandment is holy and righteous and good" v. 12. That does not follow out of the foregoing interpretation, but does not stand in opposition with the same, but rather in harmony. With the stated effect of the Law and the relationship of the Law to sin it remains basic that the Law in itself is not sin, but is holy. Yes, the Law in itself (ὁ μὲν νόμος) is holy, according to its entire content, in all its demands a mirror of the divine holiness. The sum of the Law is: "You shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy" Lv 19:2. Every individual Commandment is holy and is just and good, and it demands of man only what is right and reasonable, good and praiseworthy. We understand with Philippi the ἀγαθή of the moral good, not in the sense of "salutary," or "beneficial." "For in v. 13 "the good" τὸ ἀγαθόν evidently represents the general, essential basic concept of the three predicates ἅγιος, δίκαιος, and ἀγαθός. Sin thereby appears much more sinful, because it perverts the moral good and the salutary truth and turns it to destruction."

The summary of the instruction contained in vv. 7-12 concerning the Law and the effect of the Law is accordingly: The Law teaches man to know sin, works all evil lust, and tends to death. In the last analysis, this harmful effect does not proceed from the Law which in itself is good and holy, but from sin which takes the Law into its service.

7:13-25: The Struggle of the Regenerated.

Vv. 13-17.

Out of the foregoing the Apostle in v. 13 takes the following question: "Therefore did that which is good became a cause of death for me?" Has the good brought death to me? - but only to immediately reject it emphatically and once again to strongly call attention to the fact that sin through the good has brought death to him. At the same time he names the double purpose which God hereby had in mind. Sin should really appear as sin according to God's will. This was the intention of God, when He gave the Law to sinful man, in that it through the good worked death in him, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργασθῆναι θάνατον, "in order that it might be shown to be sin by effecting my death through that which is good." Even thereby the evil nature of sin shows itself, that it

thus misuses the good thing, the Law, and through the same puts me to death and condemns me. And in this manner through the Commandment, sin should become sinful above measure, ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἀμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἀμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς "that through the commandment sin might become utterly sinful." Sin has, as it were, outdone itself, and as Godet states, exercised a masterpiece of perversity, in that it took the Law completely into its service and turned it to curse and condemnation for me. The finis ultimus (the ultimate purpose), which God hereby had in mind, was that, where sin had become evident and powerful, grace should appear in greater splendor and unfold itself so much more powerfully. Yet of that fact the Apostle says nothing in this passage, since here he was concerned only with the matter of bringing to light the contrast between the Law and sin.

In this contrast, he illustrates in the following with an experience which he himself had with it. Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστίν, "For we know that the law is spiritual" v. 14. That is a truth well known to Christians. They know the Law as "the Law of God," ὁ νόμος τοῦ θεοῦ . Vv. 22-25. The Law is πνευματικός . As it proceeds from God, who is πνευμα, θεῶν ἐγγράφῃ πνεύματι "it stands written by God the Holy Spirit" (Theodoret), so it bears in itself the form and nature of the θεῶν πνεῦμα . Therefore the Law is nothing else than the demand of God on man. Thus its spiritual-divine form shows itself in the fact that it demands a spiritual-divine disposition, a holy, God-pleasing conduct from man.

(The Law, Paul says, is πνευματικός , spiritual. That is, it not only requires external discipline and respectability. It seeks also that our hearts live in the Spirit and maintain spiritual motivations, which are pleasing to God. These are true confidence in God, fear, and love of God.) Koerner.


[Lex, inquit, est πνευματικός , spiritualis, hoc est, non tantum requirit externam disciplinam et honestatem, sed vult quoque, ut corda, nostra in spiritu vivant et habeant motus spirituales, placentes Deo, quales sunt vera fiducia in Deum, dilectio et timor Dei.] Koerner.

(The Law is spiritual, not only by reason of the 'efficient cause,' because it is from God, but also by reason of the 'material cause' because it demands a spiritual compliance, and that not only external, but also internal, not only of the external members, but also the obedience of heart and spirit.) Calov.

[Spiritualis enim est lex, non tantum ratione causae efficientis, quia a Deo est, sed etiam ratione causae, materialis, quia spirituale obsequium, non exteriorem solum sed interiorem non membrorum tantum, sed etiam cordis et spiritus obedientiam postulat.] Calov.

"The Nomos is now, however, of a pneumatic nature and essence, insofar as it presents the ideal of a pneumatic man and would be fulfilled only by such an one." Philippi. "But I am carnal," thus Paul confesses. "Carnal" in the ethical

sense of the word, "fleshly minded," "fleshly disposed" always reads σαρκικός . Here the Apostle uses the stronger term σάρκινος in the same sense. I bear the form and the nature, that is the meaning, of the sinful, corrupt flesh in me. Yes, "sold to sin," πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν , thus a bond servant of sin. To what extent he is that , he explains in the following sentences.

"For that which I am doing I do not understand" ὁ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι, οὐ γινώσκω v. 15. Paul brings about what his flesh and what sin wills, thus the evil things, but even of that he confesses: οὐ γινώσκω "I do not know." With that he does not mean, as DeWette, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Meyer, Philippe and Godet understand him, that he was lacking proper understanding, or moral appreciation of that which he did or that he acted blindly, without a clear awareness. For when he writes further that he would not, but rather hates what he does, he is still conscious of the fact that what he does is evil. But οὐ γινώσκω also cannot mean: "I am an unaccountable riddle to myself in my actions," as, for example, Weiss would have it. On the other hand, the meaning non approbo (I do not approve), which older exegetes like Flacius, Koerner and Calov apply to the expression, is not demonstrable. The Apostle uses the verb γινώσκειν "to know" in this connection evidently in the pregnant sense, concerning which Cremer expresses himself in the following manner: "Almost without analogy in profane Greek (still cf. γνωστός , known, befriended), but in the connection of the meaning well grounded and prepared for by the corresponding use of the Hebrew  "to know," is this pregnant usage as it is in Mt 7:23: οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς "I never knew you." Jn 10:14: γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσίν με τὰ ἐμὰ, καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατήρ καὶ γὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα. "I know My own, and My own know Me, even as the Father knows Me and I know the Father" (cf. 17:25). V. 27; 1 Cor 8:3; Ga 4:9; Php 3:10; 2 Tm 2:19; 2 Cor 5:21. Cf. under . It is clear that the negative expression in Mt 7:23 would deny every, also the remotest connection with the object, cf. Mt 26:72: οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον "I do not know the man," in that the acquaintance is denied the basic condition of every connection. Cf. 2 Cor 5:21: τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν "the one not knowing sin." It is as in German keine Ahnung haben von etwas, nichts wissen von etwas (to have no foreboding concerning something, not to know concerning something). ... Contrary to that the positive γινώσκειν τινα states that the basis of a connection, and with that immediately the connection itself is present, that the object is not strange to the subject, but is well known, is familiar ... Thus γινώσκειν in such a connection designates: "to give someone consideration," (to enter into a league with someone), or to stand

in such a league." Cf. Grimm: " γινώσκειν means: to recognize as mine." It is evident that in 2 Cor 5:21 the expression τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν "who knew no sin" can say nothing else than that Christ did not have the slightest communion with sin, that it was completely strange and unfamiliar to Him. And thus Hofmann gives the exegesis of the οὐ γινώσκω in our passage correctly in that he writes: "Of that which he fulfills or accomplishes he (Paul) denies that to him it is an object of recognition. In this recognition it is not possible that the object can be included in the subject's intimate acknowledgement, and that any relation can exist between the subject and the object. Thus he denies that a communion exists between his inner life and that which he does. A strange thing because it is alien." "That which he does is inwardly strange and alien to him this is proved by the fact that the fulfills that which he does not will, even does that which he hates and abhors. That which he does, strives against the inclination of his will, and is repugnant to him inwardly. The contrast between action and will comes into expression very sharply and strongly in the heaped up synonymis (synonyms) κατεργάζεσθαι "to work," πράσσειν "to practice," ποιεῖν "to do" on the one hand, and 'οὐ γινώσκειν "to not know," οὐ θέλειν "to not wish," μίσειν "to hate," on the other hand.

Under the "being sold under sin," the Apostle understands that he cannot do what he himself wills, but must do that which is inwardly strange and repugnant to him, and that he must accomodate himself to a strange will. Sin is his master, and it is impossible for him to withhold himself from the obedience to sin.

(Compulsion I always exempt; for we sin spontaneously. It is not sin unless it is voluntary. But we are addicted thus to sin, that we are incapable of doing anything spontaneously, except to sin. Malice, which dominates in us, has snatched this from us.)

[Quemadmodum mancipia et servi trahuntur, quo volunt, et servi sunt, qui alienae voluntati vivere coguntur, ita apostolus rapi se testatur ab innata pravitae, unde ipse etiam nihilo minus abhorreat.]

But this "being sold under sin" and being bound to sin cannot now or even be regarded as a real coercion. What Calvin remarks here is to be considered:

(As slaves and menials serve where they do not wish to, but are servants who are compelled to live subject to the will of another, so the apostle confesses himself to be under duress to his innate depravity, which he himself nevertheless abhors).

[Coactionem semper excipio: sponte enim peccamus, quia peccatum non esset, nisi voluntarium. Sed addicti sumus ita peccato, ut nihil sponte possimus nisi peccare; quia malitia, quia in nobis dominatur, huc nos rapit.]

And Augustine writes:

(The will in us is always free, but it is not always good. For it is either free from righteousness, when it serves sin; then it is evil. Or it is free from sin, when it serves righteousness; and then it is good.)

[Semper autem est in nobis voluntas libera, sed non semper est bona. Aut enim a justitia libera est, quando servit peccato, et tunc est mala. Aut a peccato libera est quando servit justitia et tunc est bona.]

Whoever sins with a will, sponte (willingly) voluntarie (voluntary), otherwise it would not be sin. Sin according to its essence is the inclination of the will which is contrary to God. Every evil deed comes forth from a spontaneous act of the will, otherwise it would not be evil. Thus we must here distinguish a double will, the will which is bound to sin and is active in the fulfillment of evil, and the will which strives against sin and hates and abhors the evil. The captivity and servitude over which Paul complains consists in this, that he, because he bears the flesh in himself, simply cannot avoid willing in the evil and fulfilling the evil contrary to his own better knowledge and his own better will.

From what has been said it follows that Paul on his part approves the Law and declares it good. "But if I do the very thing I do not wish to do, I agree with the Law, confessing that it is good," εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω τοῦτο ποιῶ, σύμφωνα τῷ νόμῳ, ὅτι καλός v. 16. The meaning is not that he agrees with the judgment concerning the Law contained in the Law, with such a statement of the Law as Dt 4:8: "On what great nation is there that has statutes and judgments as righteous as this whole law?" But the meaning is that he agrees with the Law in general, stands in harmony with the same, and testifies that it is good and excellent.

Out of the circumstance that he himself does not will what he does, there follows further: νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ ἀλλὰ ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία "So now, no longer am I the one doing it, but sin which endwells me " v. 17. Both the νυνὶ δέ as well as the οὐκέτι are to be taken logically. After what has been said, the latter can no longer be maintained. His self, his ἐγώ, to which Paul calls special attention, is not that which accomplishes the evil, but the sin dwelling in him. He himself does not will the evil, but he hates it heartily. His self is not the real transgressor but sin. Indeed the sin dwells in me, ἐν ἐμοί, does not lie outside of the ἐγώ I have the sin in me, I am the one who sins, no other. But it is not my real self which fulfills the sin. My real self stands in opposition to sin. This last sentence is no longer speaking of the Law. The apology for the Law is concluded with v. 16. The contrast of the Law and sin has led the Apostle over to another contrast, that of his self and sin. With this latter contrast he would continue further.

His attention is directed to this section under consideration.

The passage expounded above, 7:13-17, gives support enough to decide the question, in which expositors were of every divided opinion. That is, whether Paul in the entire context, 7:13-25, speaks of that which he experienced before his conversion, or of that which he continually experiences in himself as a Christian. In other words, whether he in his own example here describes the condition of the unregenerated or the condition of the regenerated. The Greek fathers found the unregenerated in the entire section. Even so Augustine in his earlier time; but in the course of the Pelagian controversies he changed his viewpoint and from that time strove with all energy for the view that here the "I" of the regenerated was speaking. The Augustinian interpretation then entered into the Church of the Reformation, while most of the Papists, then the Socinians and Arminians followed the Greek fathers. Luther quoted Ro 7 about 110 times. We record here only one passage from his exposition of Ga 5:17: "In this manner he (Paul) speaks of himself in Ro 7:14: 'I am carnal, sold under sin'; and afterward in v. 23: 'I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind', etc.; likewise v. 24: 'O wretched man that I am.' Here not only the Sophists belabor themselves anxiously, but also some of the fathers, concerning how they might excuse Paul. For they consider it as disgraceful that it would be said that this chosen vessel of Christ should have sin. We believe the words of Paul, in which he openly confesses that he was sold under sin, was taken captive by sin, that he had a Law which strove against him, and that according to the flesh he served the law of sin. Here they answer again that the Apostle speaks this in the person of the godless. The godless do not complain about the opposition (rebellione), the struggle, and the servitude of sin, because sin rules mightily in them. Therefore this complaint is essentially that of Paul and of all saints. Therefore those have dealt not only unwisely but also godlessly, who excused Paul and other saints and have said that they have no sin. For with this assertion, which has arisen from an ignorance of the doctrine of faith, they have robbed the Church of the greatest comfort, destroyed the forgiveness of sins, and made Christ superfluous." The Lutheran Confessions likewise refer very frequently to Ro 7:14-25 and see therein a proof for the fact that the old Adam still clings to the believers in this life, a description of the daily repentance and contrition of the Christians, "which continues until death." Triglotta, 963.489. This is also the unanimous opinion of all later Lutheran theologians. In the "Latermann" controversy the Leipzig opinion on Ro 7 remarks: (For even those justified by natural inclination tend more to evil than to good). [nam etiam justificatus naturali inclinatione magis

propendet ad malum quam ad bonum.] Also on the Reformed side have Zwingli, Bullinger, Calvin and their followers have understood the text thus. In the time of Pietism the matter changed. While Spener still remained with the interpretation of the Reformation, the later Pietists returned to the pre-Augustinian interpretation. This later was then adopted also by the Rationalists. Today it is firmly held and defended by most modern theologians, for example, Neander, Nitzsch, Olshausen, Jul. Mueller, Tholuck, Gass, Beck, Kahnis, Meyer, Godet and Otto. Philippi, Delitzsch and Hodge have remained faithful to the Augustinian, which we can call the interpretation of the Church. Hofmann, Thomasius and Luthardt plead for a mediating application, for they suppose that in Ro 7:14 Paul indeed describes his Christian present time, but in such a way that he eliminates his living communion with Christ, thus from the fact that he is a Christian. Against this, Schott remarks very fittingly: "What concerns the latter opinion, then it must, if under that the unregenerated should not be understood, give a threefold moral condition, an entirely natural one. Then at regeneration there would be a twofold one, his own and the one growing out of the communion of life with Christ - a distinction which I am not able to draw." This abstraction, to speak with Schott, is a casus non dabilis (a case not given), and Philippi judges correctly: "If I am in Christ and portray that which I am outside of Christ, then I do not portray in concreto (concretely) what I really am, but only what I once was outside of Christ." In the second half of the 7th chapter the Apostle portrays concrete experiences of a concrete "I," and this is either the "I" of the unregenerated or the "I" of the regenerated. Tertium non daturi (only two possibilities). For this reason the explanation which Schott on his part, according to the example of Bucer and Fritzsche, designates as the "only one tenable," falls down. This occurs through the action namely: "that here the one who belongs to the community of saints of the Old Testament speaks, and certainly out of the condition which has come upon him after he in his "I" had become sinful, but thereby had also arrived at a knowledge of sin." For also in the sphere of the Old Testament communion of saints there was only a twofold class of men, unregenerated and regenerated. Thus it is and remains here the status controversiae (the state of controversy), whether Paul in Ro 7:13-25 speaks in the name of the regenerated or the unregenerated.

Those expositors who find the unregenerated in the foregoing section appeal to the fact that the same "I" speaks here as in 7:7-12. But in vv. 7-12 Paul speaks of himself throughout in the past tense, in vv. 13-25 throughout in the present tense. Thus in the first part he describes his pre-Christian past,

in the latter part his Christian present. The text offers no support for the notion that the Apostle brings home to one's mind only his past in v. 13ff. That which Paul states here regarding himself absolutely does not apply to the unregenerated. To ascribe to natural, unconverted man the willing of good, the hatred of evil, agreement with the Law is pure Pelagianism. To speak with the Augustana, the natural man has only "in some measure a free will to live honorably outwardly and to choose among the things which reason comprehends." He can prefer that which is outwardly honorable, to that which is dishonorable. But he is unable to do anything in spiritual matters. "The mind set on the flesh is hostile toward God " Ro 8:7. Natural man wills and loves nothing, but hates and abhors only everything that is God's, that God wills and loves. Thus he also resists the Law of God, which is spiritual and divine. That man wills and loves the good because it is good and well-pleasing to God, is a characteristicum (characteristic) of the Christian. Only in the Christians, who are renewed by the Spirit of God, does God work not only the accomplishment but also the willing of the good Php 2:13. Now Paul indeed confesses that he does not do the good that he wills, but much rather fulfills that which he does not will, the evil. This discord between the willing and doing, this duplicity of the "I" and the willing, as it is already portrayed in 7:13-17, is found only in a Christian who is born new through God's Spirit. The Christian is not yet completely renewed, but still has sin dwelling in himself, and bears the flesh, the old man in himself. Koerner remarks on Ro 7:15:

(Holy Scripture teaches that in the unconverted man there is only one will, but two in the regenerate. The will in those not yet reborn is not able to do anything only good, but is wholly converted to that which is evil. Not only can it not give assent and obedience to God, but it wishes and can do nothing but dissent and be repugnant to God. This will is a part of the old man, and although it remains in the regenerate, meanwhile they live, it is a perpetual blindness in the mind of the reborn, and aversion of the will from God and a conversion to evil. In the regenerate man, however, there is a twofold will, the old and the new. The old is not inwardly changed, taken away or renewed, but mortified and restrained in some degree. The new will, however, is created in the mind by the Holy Spirit. It is the new man. There are new motivations aroused by the Spirit, pleasing to God. This new will desires and approves the things of the Spirit. It approves and gives assent to God.)

[Sacra Scriptura docet, in homine non converso unam tantum esse voluntatem, in renato autem duas. Voluntas in nondum renatis non modo potest nihil ad bonum, sed tota ad malum est conversa; non solum non potest assentiri obedire Deo, sed etiam nihil aliud vult et potest, quam dissentire et repugnare bono. Haec voluntas est pars veteris hominis, et quamvis manet etiam in renatis, quamdiu vivunt, est tamen perpetua coecitas in mente non renata, et aversio voluntatis a Deo et ad malum conversio. In homine autem renato duplex voluntas est, vetus et nova. Vetus non penitus

mutatur, tollitur aut renovatur, sed aliquo modo mortificatur et reprimatur. Nova autem voluntas est creata a spiritu sancto in mente, et est homo novus, sunt novi motus, excitati a spiritu, placentes Deo, et haec nova voluntas vult et probat, quae spiritus sunt, annuit et assentitur Deo.]

The advocates of the contrary opinion refer to the expressions of ancient heathen, which also speak of a conflict between willing and doing, for example, Epict. Enchin. 2;26,4: "the one sinning wishes not to do, and the one is not wishing to do" ὁ μὲν θέλει (ὁ ἁμαρτάνων) οὐ ποιεῖ, καὶ ὁ μὴ θέλει ποιεῖ ; Eurip. Med. 1079: θυμὸς δὲ κρείσσων "stronger" τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων; Ov. Met. 7:19: Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor (I see the better and approve it, but I follow the worse). But this conflict between the better will and the power of material nature, which puts all good resolutions to shame, is active in natural man only in the natural sphere. The natural man often leans toward that which is outwardly honorable, but then, overcome by the evil desire, still does that which is shameful. Of that the Apology writes: "Nor, indeed, do we deny liberty to the human will. The human will has liberty in the choice of works and things which reason comprehends by itself. It can to a certain extent render civil righteousness or the righteousness of works; it can speak of God, offer to God a certain service by an outward work, obey magistrates, presents; in the choice of an outward work it can restrain the hands from murder, from adultery, from theft. Since there is left in human nature reason and judgment concerning objects subjected to the senses, choice between these things, and the liberty and power to render civil righteousness, are also left. For Scripture calls this the righteousness of the flesh which the carnal nature, i.e., reason, renders by itself, without the Holy Ghost. Although the power of concupiscence is such that men more frequently obey evil dispositions than sound judgment. And the devil, who is efficacious in the godless, as Paul says, Eph 2:2, does not cease to incite this feeble nature to various offenses. These are the reasons why evil civil righteousness is rare among men, as we see that not even the philosophers themselves, who seem to have aspired after this righteousness, attained it." Mueller, Symb. B. P. 218.* (*Translated from Triglotta, p. 335.) This experience of the natural man is something entirely different from the experience of the Christian, the struggle between the Spirit and the flesh, the conflict between the renewed "I" and the sin still dwelling in him, of which Paul speaks in Ro 7.

(Medea did nothing other here than what her twin Grotius learned from the pagans. For he did not discuss the struggle of the appetites of the senses versus the intellect, but rather the contention between reason and will,

which the unregenerate experience, since they choose those things they do not approve of in the mind, and follow them because they are snatched away by the aspects of the will. But he (Paul) here discusses the battle of the spirit and the flesh, which does not take place except in the regenerate. This is sufficiently established by the example of the apostle, where he speaks of himself).

[Nihil huc Medea facit aut quicquid hic geminum a gentilibus collegit Grotius. Non enim de appetitus sensitivi adversus intellectualem pugna, vel re rationis et voluntatis contentione, quam non renati experiuntur, cum ea, quae non probant mente, eligunt tamen et sequenter voluntatis affectibus abrepti; sed pugna spiritus et carnis, quae non locum habet, nisi in renatis, hic dissertitur, quod exemplo apostoli satis constat, siquidem de semet ipso loquatur.] Calov.

But how? Are there not expressions in the foregoing section, even already in the first passage, vv. 13-17, which portray the sinfulness which still clings to the Christians in all too strong and dark colors? Does the statement: "I am carnal, sold under sin," really apply to the regenerate? Theodore already, with reference to this πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν "sold to sin," judges: τὸν πρὸ τῆς χάριτος ἄνθρωπον εἰσάγει. Weiss writes: "Already these unlimited predicates, which are the strongest possible to be expressed in contrast to the πνευματικός, should have prevented the application to the regenerated man, who is in the state of grace..." "Indeed, if all the following can be said of the regenerated, then the regenerated would be like the unregenerated." To that kind of objection Hodge replies: "There is no necessity for denying that Paul here speaks of himself and describes the exercises of a renewed man. There is not an expression, from beginning to the end of this section, which the holiest man may not and must not adopt..." "It must have been in a moment of forgetfulness, that such a man as Tholuck could quote with approbation the assertion of Dr. A. Clark: 'This opinion has most pitifully and shamefully, not only lowered the standard of Christianity, but destroyed its influence and disgraced its character.' What lamentable blindness to notorious facts does such language evince! From the days of Job and David to the present hour, the holiest men have been the most ready to acknowledge and deplore the existence and power of indwelling sin." Certainly, it is nothing but foolishness and blindness, when one would so judge, that such a confession as this: "I am sold under sin" would degrade the Christian and Christianity. Luther calls these expositors who suppose that Paul speaks here in the person of the godless: "Sophists, who have experienced no spiritual temptations." Yes, such expositors have experienced very little or nothing of the power of sin and of grace. They are lacking all spiritual sense and understanding. Surely, the godless do not complain about their servitude, as Luther calls attention to it in the above

quotation. "But I am carnal, sold under sin." "For what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do." That is, as Luther says, the complaint of Paul and all saints rings out again in the hymns of penitence of the Church. The Church of God sings and teaches all her members to sing: "Ach ich bin ein Kind der Sunden, ach, ich irre weit und breit; es ist nichts an mir zu finden, als nur Ungerechtigkeit; all mein Dichten, all mein Trachten heisset unsern Gott verachten, boeslich leb ich ganz und gar und sehr gottlos immerdar. Herr, ich muss es ja bekennen, dass nichts Gutes wohnt in mir; das zwar, was wir Wollen nennen, halt ich meiner Seele fuer, aber Fleisch und Blut zo zwingen und das Gute zu vollbringen, folgt gar nicht, wie es soll, was ich nicht will, thu ich wohl."

Indeed one must correctly understand what is meant when one says of a Christian, that he is sold under sin. It is something different from the servitude of sin, into which natural man has fallen. An unconverted man is ruled completely by sin; sin forces out of him shameful lusts and works, 6:19-21. Although he also in some manner lives an honorable life, still it is sin, unbelief, pride, self-righteousness, selfishness, which determines all his actions. The servitude, on the other hand, of which Paul and all saints complain, consists according to the above remarks in the fact that the renewed "I," the renewed will, cannot carry through what it might. The regenerated, because he is still carnal, must still accommodate and bow himself to a strange will, the will of sin which dwells in him. What Paul expresses in the second half of the 7th chapter in no way contradicts what he wrote in the 6th chapter regarding the Christian's freedom from sin. He only supplements and completes here the description of the sanctification of the Christian. A believing Christian, one who is regenerated, is dead to sin and is inwardly free and unencumbered by sin. He does not permit sin to reign in his mortal body. He avoids shame and abomination. Sinning with him is not a habitus (attitude). Nevertheless he confesses and laments over the fact that he does that which he does not will, but rather hates and abhors. Daily he still sins much. Out of his natural heart there still continually arise wicked thoughts and impure desires. And even also these actus (acts) and motus interni (inner motions) belong to the doing of evil. Before he realizes it, he has spoken a word, which he is then sorry for, has done something of which he then wishes that it had not happened. With the best intention he cannot prevent that sin still mixes itself into everything. A believing Christian a regenerated person really possesses a new spiritual, divine being and life, which shows itself also in his conduct. He brings fruit to God, exercises him-

self daily in good works. At the same time he still laments and confesses that he does not do that which he wills. His action always lags behind his willing. He can never be entirely satisfied with his actions. He must also note much imperfection even in his best deeds. His daily complaint is: "That is my sorrow, which troubles me, that I cannot love Thee sufficiently as I should love Thee." And even his love for his neighbor is still very weak and defective. Of that our Confession writes: "Even as the entire holy, Christian Church, all the saints of all times have confessed and still confess. For thus Paul speaks to the Romans in 7:19: "For the good that I wish, I do not do; but I practice the very evil that I do not wish." Similarly: 'With the flesh I serve the law of sin.' For there is no one who thus fears and loves God the Lord from the whole heart as he should, no one who bears cross and tribulation in complete obedience over against God, no one who does not often doubt through weakness whether God also accepts us, whether He considers us, whether He hears our prayer. Again, who is there who performs his calling well enough, who does not rise in anger against God in temptations, when God hides Himself? Who loves his neighbor as himself?" Mueller, Symb. B. P. 117 Triglotta. In short, a devout Christian would gladly avoid all sin and do only that which pleases God, and completely fulfill God's will. That is absolutely impossible for him, because sin and the flesh still cling to him and he cannot possibly, as long as he lives on earth, lay aside the flesh entirely. All his life he does not escape from the dissension between willing and doing or out of the controversy between flesh and spirit. This is his present captivity.

Vv. 18-20.

The foregoing explanation is essentially repeated, except that modifying statements are added to the individual expressions. Here also the dual nature of the Christian is portrayed. Therefore this paragraph, which is added with γάρ, serves as an illustration and confirmation of the preceding. "These verses contain an amplification and confirmation of the sentiment of the preceding verses. They re-assert the existence and explain the nature of the inward struggle of which the Apostle had been speaking." Hodge. While the Apostle had previously spoken in general of the fact that sin dwelt in him, "sin which lives in me," ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀμαρτία he now writes more definitely, in that he expressly asserts his Christian consciousness: Οἶδα γάρ, ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, ἀγαθόν "For I know that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh." v. 18a. In as much as he still had the flesh in him, nothing good, but only evil dwelt in him. "Also here the re-

striction τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, which is added to ἐμοί, shows that Paul can speak only of the regenerated. In me, that is, in my flesh, dwells nothing good (Luther). Paul says that in his real ἐγώ something good dwells indeed. And this good can only be the pneumatic nature itself. This is so named in the highest sense and corresponds to the pneumatic nomos (name), so that under the real "I," to which the ἐγὼ σαρκικός "I am carnal" is contrasted, on the ἐγὼ πνευματικός "I am spiritual," the καινός "new," πνευματικός ἄνθρωπος "a spiritual man" can be meant." Philippii. Σάρξ "flesh" stands here, 7:5-14, and often in the the New Testament in the ethical sense, and designates the corrupt nature of man. Man is by nature and birth, flesh, entirely corrupt, and even the most noble powers and faculties of man, reason and will, are corrupt. Even the regenerate also still has the flesh in him. He also has not completely laid aside the corrupt understanding and will. Out of the flesh of the Christian come forth continually not only impure thoughts, but also erroneous, foolish thoughts, and corrupt, and God-displeasing decisions of the will. Likewise in the flesh of the Christian there dwells no good thing. The flesh of the Christian is no better than the flesh of all the other children of men. That is shown in the fact that to the Christians the will, namely, the willing of the good, lies close by, in promptu est παράκειται, "is present" according to the new man, but that he does not find the accomplishment of the good. V. 18b. "In that the Apostle looks around himself, as it were, in the area of his inward self, he finds the θέλειν "to wish" of the good lying before him. But concerning κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλόν "to do good," for which he is looking he must say οὐκ εὕρισκω, "I find it not," which means, "I know not where it is, it is not there..." "Still the meaning is not that the believer always has only a completely ineffective desire. The believer in his best actions, in that sin is intermingled with them, does not fulfill the act, which corresponds to his will which is sanctified by the Spirit of God." Philippii. Moreover, the sense remains the same, even if one does not read the εὕρισκω which nevertheless is sufficiently attested. This statement the Apostle explains in v. 19, in that he repeats, as it were, the statement of v. 15, which has become an axiom, only in a fuller form, with a more express addition of ἀγαθόν and κακόν: "For the good that I wish I do not do, but I practice the very evil that I do not wish." We are once more reminded that, as the willing of the good is not entirely ineffective, so the doing of the evil also includes in itself the inner acts and motions of the perverted, fleshly will. From the fact that I do that which I do not will, it follows, however, that it

is not my own real self which fulfills that which is evil, but the sin which dwells in me. v. 20. Thus also this deduction the Apostle brings to expression the second time and thereby emphatically gives the Christian to consider that in the conflict between the ἐγὼ πνευματικός and the ἐγὼ σαρκικός the former predominates and prevails, that the renewed self is the real self of the Christian.

Vv. 21-23.

Now the question arises: How is the statement: Εὕρισκω ἄρὰ τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται "I find then the principle that evil is present in me, the one who wishes to do good," in v. 21 to be construed and explained? The expression τὸ νόμον is understood by a considerable number of expositors as the Mosaic Law, but the entire statement with this understanding of νόμος is interpreted very differently. The Greek fathers and among later expositors, for example, Bengel, Semler and Morus, construe and explain: "Thus I find the Law for me, to which I am willed, to do good, because the evil lies near me." This means, thus I find the Law, insofar as I have the will to do the good, stand by my side approvingly, because the evil lies close to me. Therefore I need the Law as a συγγόρον and an ἐπιτελὸν τὸ βούλημα. (Chrysostom) Against this Meyer remarks correctly, that the thought, which would according to that be given by the dative τὸ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ etc., would have to be expressed more definitely and emphatically than by the mere dativus commodi (dative of advantage). Hofmann likewise takes ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται "that the evil is present to me" as the basic declaration, the first part of the verse, thus as the principal clause. He then takes τὸ κακὸν as predicate to εὕρισκω τὸν νόμον, allows τῷ θέλοντι ποιεῖν to depend on τὸ καλὸν. He thus finds "an expression which indicates for what the speaker recognizes the Law, namely, for that which is good to him who would do it. However, he discovers it to be so, because the evil is present with him."... "When he comes to act, then the evil is there and presents itself to him, so that he should do it. But his will is not to do the evil but the good. Now since the Law forbids the evil and commands the good, therefore he finds that it is good for him in what he wants to do. The contrast between that which he wills and that which is at hand to him, permits him to become aware of the agreement between his willing and the Law. It permits him to perceive that which he wills, if he did that which the Law commands. Thus the knowledge grows in him that it is the Law which he should do as one who wills the good. But out of the sad condition there arises for him the knowledge that the evil lies so directly near

to him."..."But the Apostle could hardly have expressed his thought with more difficulty." Thus Luthardt judges. And Godet: "Can one imagine a more complicated thought and a more elaborate construction than this?" Especially is it grammatical violence to separate τὸ καλόν from ποιεῖν and to combine it with εὐρίσκω τὸν νόμον . What is more, this explanation, like the foregoing also, contradicts the nexus rerum (the joining together of things). Such a justification of the Law lies completely outside of the context. With the demonstration that the Law is not evil but good and holy, the Apostle had long before finished. Already from v. 14 on, and self-evidently without reference to the Law, from v. 17 on, he describes the duplicity of his "I" and the contrast between his willing and doing. And that is evidently also the reigning thought in the passage, vv. 21-23. With this basic thought of the entire section a third conception, for which Olshausen, Fritzsche and others plead, would suit this translation: "I find then the principle that evil is present in me, the one who wishes to do good." But a double object with ποιεῖν appears burdensome, and the expression τὸν νόμον ποιεῖν is not found otherwise. Meyer also calls attention to that. Indeed he only strengthens the grammatical crudeness and difficulty, in that he explains on his part: "Thus I find, while my will is turned toward the Law, in order to do the good, that the evil lies before me." It is unbelievable that with the unusual expression τὸν νόμον θέλειν Paul is supposed to have designated "the moral interest, the desire and love for the Law." In short, one cannot reasonably shelter the Mosaic Law in the statement in v. 21. With most of the expositors, for example, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Tholuck, Beck, Hodge, Philippi, Godet, Ebrard, Weiss and Luthardt, we take τὸν νόμον in our passage in the general sense of rule, as, for example, in 4:27. In the following verses the expression νόμος is used in different meanings. It appears to us as the most natural thing to combine the dative τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοῦ etc. with παράκειται and to take for granted a shift of the stressed dative object, which then brings with it the repetition of the ἐμοῦ after ὅτι . Thus there presents itself in simple form the simple plain thought: Thus I find the rule, that the evil lies near at hand to me, who would do the good. I would gladly do the good, but the evil lies so close to me, offers itself to me, and mingles into all my comings and goings. That is essentially the same thing that the Apostle had already previously explained, therefore we take the ἄρα not as a real particle of deduction but as one of recapitulation. A new element lies in the εὐρίσκω τὸν νόμον . The Apostle emphasizes that this experience of his, of which he had previously spoken, was no exception, but the rule. "Very

significantly this experience is called a rule, precisely because it expresses no accidental and passing, but a necessary and continuing phenomenon." Philippi.

The double statement in v. 21 contains the conclusion, in which the previous explanation is summed up. Still the Apostle adds to this double statement an explanation, vv. 22-23, which brings the duplicity of his "I" to the strongest expression. V. 22 corresponds to the first half of the 21st verse: *Συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον* . "For I joyfully concur in the law of God in the inner man." We translate: "I rejoice in the law of God" and not: "I rejoice with the law of God." It is an all too strong personification and presents a difficult thought, when one ascribes joy to the Law. "To want to deny that σύν in such combinations as *συνκαίρω* , *συνήδομαι* , *συλλυποῦμαι* can also have the sense of designating the delight and sorrow over something as the corresponding form and manner of the share which one takes therein and it is simply incomprehensible in view of the idiom." Hofmann. Cf. Demosthenes, 194,23. Euripides, Hipp. 1250.1276. Herodet 9,94. *ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* is in itself the inner man, the inward part of man, the thinking, willing, feeling, and perception of a man. Still according to the context, since here delight in God's Law is attributed to the inner man then in contrast the flesh is regarded as sin. The concept *ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* appears as identical with the concept *ὁ καὶνὸς ἄνθρωπος* . In the regeneration it is above all the inner man - heart, understanding, and will which are renewed. In the same sense the expression *ὁ ἔσωθεν ἄνθρωπος* is used in 2 Cor 4:16 and the expression *ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* in Eph 3:16. According to the inward or new man Paul and every regenerated one has his heartfelt desire and delight in the Law of God, just because it is God's, because it is good, spiritual, divine, because it reveals the unchangeable, holy will of God. And how gladly he would follow the Law of God in all its parts!

"But," and that is now the other side, the correlate of v. 21b, *βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου* "But I see a different law in the members of my body, waging war against the law of my mind, and making me a prisoner of the law of sin which is in my members" v. 23. Paul perceives another law, *ἕτερον νόμον* , which is of an entirely different kind from the Law of God. And this other law he calls a law in his members. We combine *ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου* with *νόμον* , corresponding to the *τῷ νόμῳ-τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν* at the close of the verse. Under the law in the members we do not understand, as it is frequently taken, the power of the material nature or the selfish impulse, through which the better self is overcome, held captive

and made impotent. This explanation is connected with the basic error of the modernists, as if the Apostle in this entire section describes the moral condition of the natural, unconverted man. On the other hand, we do not, as, for example, Philippi, in accordance with the pattern of the older exegetes, include under the τὰ μέλη also the higher powers and faculties of man, like understanding and will, so far as these are still not renewed by the Spirit of God. Τὰ μέλη means simply "the members," the members of the body, nothing further. The "law in the members" and "the members" are two different things. The "law in the members" the Apostle defines himself, where he repeats the expression as "the law of sin," ὁ νόμος τῆς ἀμαρτίας. The law of sin is sin itself, as a norm, insofar as it seeks to determine the actions of the man. Now sin does not really have its real habitation and its real root in the body and in the members of the body, but in the inner parts of man, in the heart, understanding, and will. That applies also to the sin which still dwells in the believing Christian. Their heart, mind, understanding and will are still not entirely renewed. That also applies to the sin which still dwells in the believing Christians. But the perverted mind and will, which still remain in the regenerated, are powerful and active also even in the members of the body and are able to take possession of the members and force them to do evil. A Christian experiences that every day, how his members incline to sin, how they are drawn to evil with a hidden power. And precisely therein he observes the law of sin.

Of the law of sin, the law in the members, the Apostle states further, and on that lies the emphasis in our verse: waging war against the law of my mind, and making me a prisoner," etc. Then when he was about to fulfill the Law of God, in which he had his delight, he saw this other law as an armed enemy which opposed him and by all powers hindered the fulfilling of the good. The law of sin resists and opposes the Law of God. Sin is the turning of the will which is contrary to God, and at the same time "the law of my mind." Ὁ νοῦς correspond entirely with the concept ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος and includes the entire inner life of man, thinking, willing, feeling and sensibility. But in our passage according to the context, as the antithesis shows, it designates the thinking, willing and feeling, which are renewed and sanctified by the Spirit of God. And ὁ νόμος τοῦ νοός μου, "the law of my mind," is the νοῦς, "my mind," itself, insofar as it is the norm which seeks to determine my actions. The regenerated, insofar as he is born again, is spiritually minded and disposed, is a norm and law to himself. He bears in himself God's Law and will, in which he has his pleasure, and wills for himself only that which God wills, and which pleases God. But now

against that there strives the law of sin. It comes to a heated battle. The result is that the law of sin in the members maintains the upper hand. It makes me a prisoner of war and holds me firmly in captivity, obligates me to do its will, and also presses my members into the service of sin. Instead of writing: αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἑαυτῷ, as one should expect, the Apostle repeats the subject noun, in order to close the description of this difficult conflict with the strong, full expression τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου. . This leaves behind for the Christian readers an impression of the power of the adversary, with whom they have to deal as long as they live on earth. It makes no difference to the meaning, whether one reads τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας or ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. This is the dativus commodi (dative of advantage). The law of sin takes us captive for its own use and service. This means that we are held firmly in the captivity of the law of sin. Moreover that which the Apostle says here concerning the captivity of war is meant just as being sold under sin in v. 14. St. Paul and everyone who is regenerated feels and experiences as an imprisonment the impossibility of ever laying sin aside completely and attaining perfect holiness. A believing Christian strives unceasingly and opposes sin when it raises battle against him. He does not slacken in the struggle in the knowledge and feeling that he shall not be master entirely, over sin in this life. He does not satisfy himself with a certain measure and degree of sanctification in the knowledge that he can never attain the final and highest degree. He strives and struggles for a more complete victory over sin, for more complete sanctification. He always again overcomes the evil with good and steadily grows in the spiritual, divine essence and life. But he never accomplishes that sin can lay nothing more to his charge. He cannot withdraw himself, in the notions and thoughts of his heart, in the members of his body completely from the influence, and the sway and power of sin. To this extent he is and remains a prisoner of sin all his life.

Finally we point to the fact that also our Lutheran Confession refers the strongest part of this section, 7:21-23, to the struggle for sanctification, which begins with conversion. "But when man is converted, and is thus enlightened, and his will is renewed, it is then that man wills what is good (so far as he is regenerated or a new man) and 'delights in the law of God after the inward man,' Ro 7:22, and henceforth does good to such an extent and as long as he is impelled by God's Spirit. ... And nevertheless that also (the strife of the flesh and spirit) remains in the regenerate of which St. Paul wrote, Ro 7:22ff.: 'For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members,

warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.'" Trig., p. 904-7. "Now, there remains also in the regenerate, an obstinacy (a certain rebelliousness) of which the Scriptures speak, namely, that, 'For the flesh sets its desires against the spirit,' Ga 5:17, likewise, that 'fleshly lusts which wage war against the soul,' 1 Pe 2:11, and that 'the law in the members waging war against the law of the mind,' Ro 7:23. Accordingly, the man who is not regenerate resists God altogether, and is entirely a servant of sin, Jn 8:34; Ro 6:16. The regenerate person, however, delights in the Law of God after the inward man. But nevertheless he sees in his members the law of sin, which wages war against the law of the mind. On this account he serves the Law of God with his mind, but with the flesh, the law of sin, Ro 7:25." Trig., p. 912-13.

Vv. 24-25.

The Apostle has concluded with the theme of the section, with the description of the Christian sanctification as a struggle with sin. We can call this explanation, in which he speaks of the sin dwelling in him, the confession of penance of Paul and of all saints. This confession of penance ends in a cry of lamentation and a cry for help. The cry of lamentation reads: Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος, "O wretched man that I am." A regenerate person experiences the previously depicted servitude of sin as the greatest misery, the greatest distress on earth. The cry for help reads: Τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου "Who will set me free from the body of this death?" We translate, in that we combine τούτου with τοῦ σώματος : A.V.: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" A Christian knows His Deliverer and Redeemer, and knows that the same shall finally deliver him also from all evil and thus also from the sin which still clings to him. The sense of the question is: O, that the hour of deliverance were already here! A Christian yearns for deliverance "from the body of this death," which he still bears, which belongs to death. He yearns for deliverance from his "mortal body," 6:12, which, because it is so weak and frail, is also such a weak organ of the Spirit and is so easily servile to sin. He longs for the time, when he in the glorified body can live for God and serve Him freely and unhindered. To the cry for help there is added a cry of thanks: Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν "I give thanks to God through Jesus Christ our Lord " V. 25a. This reading, which Ἀ' AKL offer, appears more certified than the other, which still can come into question, which is offered by C: Χάρis τῷ θεῷ "thanks to God." The sense in both cases is the same. Paul and every believing Christian expresses

thanks to God through Jesus Christ, our Lord. This giving of thanks offers no supportable sense, if at the same time it is not stated why and for what a Christian thanks God. The following statement in v. 25b names the basis and the object of the thanksgiving. Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας "So then, on the one hand I myself with my mind am serving the law of God, but on the other, with my flesh the law of sin." These words contain a short recapitulation of the entire foregoing explanation. This recapitulation is so stated, that one recognizes how a Christian, who bemoans his present status quo (the existing state of affairs) and wishes to be freed from it, on the other hand has reason to give thanks to God. Most of the modern expositors place v. 25b in contrast to v. 25a and have the Apostle say, that in Christ, when he regards his relationship to Christ, he really has reason to thank God. On the other hand, he himself, confined to his own person, αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, aside from Christ, finds himself in that unfortunate situation, that he still serves the flesh, even while he also serves God with his mind. But in this manner, disregarding from the entire erroneous comprehension of the whole passage, that cry of thanks is isolated and wholly understandable. With Thomasius we understand the αὐτὸς ἐγὼ like the stressed ἐγὼ in v. 14 and v. 17, of the real "I." That is certainly thankworthy that the Christian with his real "I" with his renewed mind serves God and the Law of God, even though with the flesh he still serves the law of sin. The grammatical coordination of the two members of the sentence in v. 25b by means of μὲν and δέ does not hinder laying the emphasis on the first member and referring the strengthening of the "I," the αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, only to this first expression. Thus a Christian in his present lamentation over sin should not forget what he is and has as a Christian. He should thank God through Jesus Christ, our Lord, to whom he owes this present, ever so blessed condition of a Christian.

The expounded passage, 7:13-25, as it has proven itself to us, completes the picture which the Apostle had previously sketched of the sanctification of the Christian. What he had written in Chapter 6 and in the beginning of Chapter 7 regarding that the Christians are free and unburdened from sin and the Law, only an unwise person could point to the fact that a Christian can and must be completely rid of sin already in this life. Certainly this misunderstanding is already excluded by the manner of speech, as 6:12: "Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body." For such admonition presupposes that sin continues to remain in the Christian. Still the Apostle opposes expressly that Methodist opinion regarding complete sanctification. St. Paul shows in our passage that

not absolute sinlessness, but the struggle between flesh and spirit, the battle with the indwelling sin is a characteristicum (characteristic) of the Christian. It is obvious how this knowledge is offered, that the Christians maintain the comfort of the right faith; that it never escapes their mind that they are justified before God and are saved only by grace. Even the holiest man, like Paul, is lost, if in puncto critico, in the judgment of God he depends on his own works or his own devoutness. For there it does not stand the test. The summary of the section accordingly is:

The Apostle laments and sighs in the name of all regenerated persons over the conflict between willing and doing, and that the flesh and sin, still clings to him and is a hindrance at every step and turn in the exercise of the good.

CHAPTER 8

8:1-17: The Walking in the Spirit

Vv. 1-4

Ancient expositors, along with the modern ones, especially Hodge, suppose that the Apostle now turns back to his principal theme; the doctrine of justification. In 8:1-4 they find the thought carried out that the Christians are justified before God without guilt, because the law of the Spirit, that is, the Gospel, has freed them from the curse of the Law. Christ, God's Son, has atoned for the guilt of sin and has fulfilled the Law for them. But one need only attentively read through the entire section, the first half of the 8. chapter, in order to recognize that Paul here dwells further on the same theme. He deals with the same theme explained from 6:1 on, the sanctification of the Christian, which he now places under the viewpoint of the life and conduct in the Spirit. He had completed the doctrine of justification at the close of the 5. chapter.

Therefore one cannot take the first statement of the new section, 8:1, the well-known statement: "There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus," from its context and treat it as a proof passage for the doctrine of justification. The Greek text reads: Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ "There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus." Those expositors, who in the foregoing section, in the second half of the 7. chapter, find the condition of the unregenerated pictured. They take for granted that the Apostle with these words begins to describe his Christian presence or, generally speaking, the condition of the regenerated, for whom the union of life with Christ is characteristic. They stress the νῦν which they understand in the temporal sense. But Paul had already previously spoken completely in the present tense. And in this interpretation the ἄρα is out of place. The status regeneratorum (state of regeneration) is the reverse of the status irregeneratorum (state of ^{unregener-}ation) and does not follow out of the latter. It

follows well from the correctly understood Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ "So then, on the one hand I myself with my mind am serving the law of God," etc., 7, 25, wherein, as we have seen that the foregoing explanation is comprehended. As the Apostle states first of all, that for those who are in Christ, that is, the believing Christians, in whose name Paul had spoken previously with the ἐγὼ, there is no judgment of condemnation 8, 1. One could believe, though sin is offensive to them, that with their continuing sins they bring wrath and punishment upon themselves. Now, however, the Apostle gives them the assurance that they need to fear no judgment because of their sins of weakness. Especially not, because with their renewed mind and will they serve the Law of God, have pleasure in the Law of God, and, on the other hand, hate and abhor evil. Also before God the renewed self of the Christian appears as his real self, according to which His judgment is formed. God judges the Christian according to the new man, not according to the old man, and therefore does not account to him the evil that his flesh still does. This connection of thought is indicated clearly and significantly by the Ἄρα νῦν, which we with Philippi, take as a strengthened particle of deduction, in the sense of Ἄρα οὖν. So also Luther in his "Randglossen" on Ro 8:1 has very correctly given the exegesis, in that he remarks: "Although sin still rages in the flesh, it does not condemn, because the spirit is just and strives against it." That the flesh still clings to the Christian, in which sin rages, does not condemn him. This is because his spirit, mind and will are born anew, are good and just, and strive against sin. What the Apostle writes here in no way contradicts that which he had previously taught concerning justification through Christ's blood and righteousness, but rather presupposes the doctrine of justification. This remains firm that also the sins of weakness of the Christian are damnable in themselves, that the Christians in their bestworks, with their devoutness and sanctification cannot stand in the judgment of God. This is because so much sin and imperfection still clings to them, that the Christians must continually seek forgiveness in Christ's blood and wounds also for their frequent sins of weakness. The Apostle, according to his foregoing instruction on sin and grace, no longer treats of justification, but of the other great work of God, which follows upon justification, of regeneration, renewal and sanctification. And therefore to the Christians, who are troubled by this that their sanctification is still so imperfect, he gives the comfort that God looks upon the new mind and will in them. God takes the good will, as it were, for the deed and does not take into consideration what the flesh does to the contrary. Certainly this latter would be impossible, if

each and every sin were not atoned for and expiated through Christ's death and blood. God who is reconciled in Christ looks upon the pardoned, justified sinners, the believing, regenerated Christians as if they were entirely spirit, as if they had no more flesh in them. That the Apostle otherwise in our passage designates the Christians even as those who are in Christ Jesus, that is, live, move and have their being in Christ as their element, is related to his entire argument, which continues in the following. And this argumentation is valid, even if one omits the little accredited addition: *μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα* "They walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit," v. 1. Doubtlessly these very significant words are found at the end of v. 4.

The following three verses, vv. 2-4, form a close context, which we must first clarify before we can understand the connection with v. 1, which is designated with *γάρ*. *Ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἤλευθέρωσέ σε ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου*. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and of death." V. 2. Thus the Apostle continues, in that with his own experience he illustrates once again that which all Christians, have experienced in themselves. For *ἤλευθέρωσέ* is in any case the original reading. The lesser accredited reading *ἤλευθέρωσέ σε*, which many exegetes accept, arose by this that the closing syllable of the verb is read double. The Law of the Spirit is none other than the Spirit Himself, the Spirit of God, insofar as He determines the conduct of man. The law of sin is sin itself, insofar as sin determines the conduct of man. The law of sin at the same time is called a law of death, since the sin delivers over to death those who follow and serve it. The Spirit is more closely designated as a Spirit of life, which is in Christ Jesus. We combine *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* with *τῆς ζωῆς*. For the Spirit here comes into consideration not insofar as He mediates life, but insofar as He mediates the life in Christ. The Spirit of God - thus every Christian confesses with Paul - has imparted to me that life which is in Christ Jesus, so that I now am and live in Christ Jesus. Thereby He has freed me from the law of sin and death, to which I had been subjected by nature and birth. Therefore it is no longer sin but the Spirit which is the norm of my life. This act of freeing by the Spirit is identical with that act of God, which designates the beginning of our Christianity, of which the Apostle had spoken in 6:3ff. Therefore in Baptism we are dead with Christ, dead to sin, and have become partakers of the resurrection of Christ, of the new, spiritual, divine essence, in which Christ now stands and lives.

That is especially the office and work of the Spirit of God, that He, through Word and Sacrament, applies the work and benefit of Christ to the individual. How the freedom, of which Paul speaks in this verse, agrees with the captivity, of which he had spoken previously, is proven sufficiently above.

More difficult and more complicated than v. 2 is the following sentence, v. 3: Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί "For what the law could not do, weak as it was through the flesh, God did: sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh." τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, the substantivized adjective with the following genitive, means nothing else than "the impotence" or "the weakness of the Law" and is a prefixed apposition to the following principal clause together with its supplement, v. 4. A similar construction is found in He 8:1: κεφάλαιον οὖν ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα "Now the main point in what has been said is this: we have such a high priest" etc. The corresponding German manner of speech is possibly: "Was das Unvermoege des Gosetzes anlangt" (what concerns the impotency of the Law). That is according to the sense, the same as "what was impossible for the Law." Wherein the impotency of the Law proved itself, "what was impossible for the Law," is evident only in the following. First of all Paul adds a short confirmation to the prefixed appositional phrase ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, "in that it was weak through the flesh" or "by means of the flesh." With that he observes that the impotency or weakness of the flesh under discussion has its foundation not in the Law itself, but in the sinful flesh of the children of men, to whom the Law had been given. The subject of the principal clause is ὁ θεός and the verbum finitum (finite words), the predicate is κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. Between the subject and the predicate, however, there is inserted a clause, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας...περὶ ἁμαρτίας, which the verb makes understandable. Thus the framework of the sentence is this: What concerns the impotency of the Law ... thus God, in that He sent His Son ... has condemned the sin in the flesh. We begin by recalling the sense and content of the individual parts of the sentence.

God has sent His Son. God's act of love is emphasized by placing τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν first. Likewise, through ἑαυτόν, cf. ὕδιος υἱός, "His own Son," 8:32, the relationship of the Son is designated as metaphysical, cf. 1:3. Through πέμπειν "to send" etc. the personality of Christ is designated as preexistent,

cf. Ga 4:4." Philippi. God had sent His Son, who had been begotten of His essence, who had come forth from His loins (Godet), into the world. ἐξαπέστειλεν

"(God) had sent forth," Ga 4:4, εἰς τὸν κόσμον "into the world,"

Jn 10:36. God sent His Son ἐν ὁμολώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας "in the likeness of sinful flesh," (ἐν means: clothed with), "so that He appears in an outward form of existence, which was similar to the sin-laden nature of man" Meyer. Here also ὁμολῶμα is to be taken as a concretum (factor). "Christ appeared not ἐν σαρκὶ ἁμαρτίας "in sinful flesh," which is the Ebionite conception, nor ἐν ὁμολώματι σαρκὸς "in the likeness of flesh," which is the Docetic conception, but ἐν ὁμολώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας "in the likeness of sinful flesh," which is the biblical-Pauline view. Σάρξ is here evidently the entire human nature, as in John 1:14; Romans 1:3; 9:5; 1 John 4:2, according to body and soul" Philippi. The Son of God has become σάρξ, flesh, that is, man, John 1:14. He has been manifested ἐν σαρκί, in the flesh, in the human nature, 1 Tm 3:16. He was without sin, He 4:15. Yet His human nature and appearance resembled the sinful flesh of the children of men, insofar that it was also subject to the weaknesses and infirmities of the human nature, which are the result of sin, and subject to death. God sent His Son περὶ ἁμαρτίας, "on account of sin." This general expression includes every relationship of Christ to human sin. Christ should through His human life, suffering and death, atone for and expiate the sins of men, and He has done it. Meyer remarks correctly on περὶ ἁμαρτίας: "It comprises rather the entire relationship, in which the sending of Christ stood over against human sin. Therefore its atonement as well as the breaking of its power, which latter is in this place set into prominence with κατέκρυψε etc., as the especial factor."

The predicate of the sentence is κατέκρυψε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. . Most of the expositors, correctly, take κατακρίνειν not of "punishment," or "destruction," but of "condemnation," and of an actual condemnation of sin, and thereby combine ἐν τῇ σαρκί with κατέκρυψε. Most ancient expositors then understand this expression of the fact that Christ through His flesh, that is, through His suffering and death in the flesh, has taken away the right of sin to accuse man, thus has atoned for the guilt of the sin. Thus essentially also Philippi and Hodge. Most modern exegetes, on the other hand, here find predicated the removal of the power and sovereignty of sin, so that God has denied sin the power "to hold men in its dominion." They refer ἐν τῇ σαρκί either also to the death of Christ or point it to the fact, "that through the suffering and death of Christ (thus, for example, Meyer), or through the holy and sinless life of

Christ (thus, for example, Godet, Weiss) it is God who has overcome sin there where it had its dominium, its sphere of jurisdiction." The context doubtlessly leads to the thoughts of "the breaking" of the power of sin. This thought, however, finds its most adequate expression in the given words, when we with Hofmann take ἐν τῇ σαρκί with τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, for which also the position of the words speaks. The expression ἐν τῇ σαρκί corresponds then to the foregoing σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας. If with ἐν τῇ σαρκί the flesh of Christ was supposed to be meant, then αὐτοῦ would not dare be lacking. Nothing grammatically opposes the combination τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. In New Testament Greek, as already remarked earlier, prepositional phrases are often added to a substantive without an article. That generally happens in the case which Hofmann characterizes thus: "Where the prepositional modifier is of the kind that the concept, to which it is joined, will not be considered at all without it, it can join itself to it immediately." The meaning accordingly is, that God has judged sin which has its habitation in the flesh, in the corrupt nature of man rules the same. And now one dare not weaken the concept κατακρίνειν, "judge." The power, which sin has over the natural man, can, as we have shown this with δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας "is freed from sin," 6, 7, be regarded also as a legal claim, which sin has made on man. Man stands by nature and birth, as it were, under the jurisdiction of sin. And now God has denied, has taken from sin this right to hold man in its dominion and to master his nature. He has freed man from the jurisdiction of sin. Still we do not have to think here with Hofmann of the subjective deliverance from the power and right of sin, which God confers upon the individual through His Spirit, so that the foregoing statement would be identical with v. 2. The preceding participial clause speaks against that. No, the Apostle here speaks of that which God has done in Christ once for the benefit of all mankind. God has sent His Son in the form of sinful flesh, in order to atone for and expiate sin. In this manner, through Christ's life, suffering and death, He has first of all atoned for the guilt of sin. But then also - and thereon lies the emphasis, which lies on the κατέκρινε, - He invalidated the sin, which had firmly established itself in the flesh of man, in genere (in general). He had redeemed man from the power and dominion, from the right of sin.

With such condemnation of sin in the flesh, God had aimed at the point, ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν "in order that the requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us," v. 4. Δικαίωμα never means, "judgment of justification," thus also not in our passage either "demand of right" or "legal maxim." In connection with τοῦ νόμου it can have only the first meaning. That

was thus God's will and intention, that with us it should come to a fulfillment of the Law. This intention is also fulfilled. The Law is fulfilled in us, "who do not walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit," ἐν ἡμῖν, τοὺς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα . We Christians walk not after the impulse and lusts of the flesh, but follow the impulse and leading of the Holy Spirit. Whereto the Spirit urges us is nothing else than what is right and good before God, what God demands of all men in His Law. The necessary supposition for this, however, was the condemnation of the sin in the flesh. Christ, in that He has redeemed us from the power and dominion of sin, has helped us, so that we now fulfill God's Law and live not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit. What Christ, what God in Christ has done, that the Spirit of God has attributed to us. The Spirit of Christ has taken us, when we became Christians, actually from the bonds of sin, from the Law, and from the dominion of death through Baptism into the name of Christ. Now He dwells in us and teaches us to do according to God's pleasure and leads us on a suitable way.

Evidently now that which we read here in v. 4, ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν "in order that the requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us," etc., is the correlate to τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου "what the law could not do," v. 3a, and allows us to see how the latter expression is meant. The weakness and the incapacity of the Law does not consist in the fact that the same cannot redeem us from sin, (who could expect that from the Law?) but in the fact that it does not help us with its own fulfillment. The Law does not enable man to decide to walk according to the Law, because it was hindered by the sinful flesh of man from reaching his will. God has thereby made that possible for us, which was impossible for the Law, that He through His Son condemned the sin in the flesh.

Now we recognize how the γάρ , v. 3, and the γάρ , v. 2, is meant. The present status quo (the state in which anything is, the state existing), that we Christians walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. Whereto the sending of Christ and His redemption has made us capable, is proof of the act of deliverance of the Spirit. With this our condition of being Christians had begun, proof for the fact that the Spirit had actually freed us from the law of sin and death. This simple fact, that we are freed through the Spirit of life in Christ from the law of sin and now walk according to the Spirit and fulfill the Law, is the foundation and cause why there is no longer any judgment of condemnation for us. This latter statement, v. 1, had already been established previously, in that it had followed from 7, 25. Just this confirmation is then

expanded and completed in the statement in vv. 2-4. That we serve the Law of God with our mind, with our real self, is directed to the end that we, being freed from the law of sin, fulfill the Law of God and walk according to the Spirit. Strikingly Luther gives the connection of the four verses, 8:1-4, in the already mentioned marginal notes:

Although sin really still rages in the flesh, still it does not condemn, because the Spirit of God is righteous and strives against it. Where He is not, there the Law is weakened and transgressed by the flesh, so that it is impossible that the Law should help man, except to sin and death. Therefore God sent His Son and laid upon Him our sin, and thus helped us to fulfill the Law through His Spirit.

The modern exegetes cannot at all accept the fact that here in the 8 chapter the same self, the same moral condition should be described as in the second half of the 7 chapter. Just the closing part of the passage, 8:1-4, the purpose clause in v. 4, appears to contradict that which the Apostle had previously written concerning his captivity under the law of sin. But it only appears to be so. In reality both 7:14, 23, 25b as also 8:4 agree with the present condition of the Christian, with the experience of the regenerated. Calov writes:

(Moreover, it is one thing to serve the law of sin in the flesh when one serves the law of God in the mind. This is affirmed concerning the regenerate who are not altogether spiritual, Ro 7:25. It is another thing to walk according to the flesh and not according to the Spirit. This does not take place in the regenerate; neither can it be consistent with the grace of God and justifying faith. Because there it is an unwilling servitude, but here it is voluntary in those things which the flesh insists upon, like being seized by the consequences. "To walk," Ps 1:1 infers a voluntary and evilminded frequenting of sin. In one case the flesh battles against the spirit without predominating, but in the other the flesh predominates. The regenerated, however, though they feel the weaknesses of the flesh, nevertheless do not walk according to the flesh nor indulge in carnal desires).

[Caeterum aliud est servire carne legi peccati, cum legi Dei mente servitur, quod de renatis, quia non prorsus spirituales sunt, affirmatur cap. VII v. ult., aliud ambulare non secundum spiritum, ed secundum carnem, quod in renatus locum non habet, nec cum gratia Dei aut fide justificante consistere potest. Quia ibi invita servitus est, hic voluntaria in iis, quae caro dictitat, exsequendis occupatio; nam ambulare studium et frequentationem peccati voluntariam et malitiosam infert Ps 1:1. Ibi caro luctatur quidem adversus spiritum, non autem ei praedominatur, hic vero praedominatur caro. Renati ergo etsi imbecillitates carnis adhuc sentiant, non tamen secundum carnem ambulant, aut carnalibus desideriis indulgent.]

The regenerated still sin daily, out of the weakness of their corrupted flesh and blood. Thereby they still serve the law of sin, even though contrary to their will, contrary to their better wishing, because the flesh clings to them their

whole life long. But the flesh does not govern their life, or their conduct. Caro non praedominatur. They walk, not being dominated by the flesh but by the Spirit. The Spirit of God has the predominance in them and determines their actions. Thus their conduct agrees with the Law of God, even though their fulfillment of the Law is still imperfect and their action remains far behind their willing. Because the Spirit has the power among them, therefore God does not reckon the weaknesses of their flesh to them, because the Son of God through His life, suffering and death in the flesh has atoned for all the sins and transgressions of men. Moreover, that which the Apostle remarks in 8:1-4 concerning the non-condemnation of the sins of weakness of the Christians, is only an additional remark within the extensive, comprehensive description of Christian sanctification, which had begun in 6:1. The statement in 8:4 in which the section 8:1-4 comes to an end, has, even though it serves as a confirmation of v. 1, an independent significance. The thought expressed here is further developed in the following. The expression, that we Christians fulfill the Law and walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit, gives its character to the entire section, 8:1-17, in which the concept πνεῦμα stands out everywhere. This is, the manner of Paul, that he gives expression to a principal thought, which he then carries out, often first in a subordinate sentence; perhaps in a statement of confirmation.

8:5-11

It is most apparent that in this section the contrast between the flesh and the Spirit is further illustrated, namely in the manner, that those who are carnal are contrasted to those who are spiritual. The former are called in v. 5 οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες "those who are according to the flesh," that is, those who are fashioned according to the flesh, who have their moral fashion and nature from the flesh. The latter, οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα scil. ὄντες, that is, those who are fashioned according to the Spirit, who are regenerated by the Spirit and are therefore spirit. John 3:6. The carnally fashioned follow, that which is of the flesh, τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν "minds on the things of the flesh." φρονοῦσιν includes both, thinking and willing. Τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αἵ are "things" or "interests" of the flesh, more exactly designated τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς, "the works of flesh," as they are enumerated, for example, in Ga 5:19. Weiss. The thinking and endeavors of the carnal minded tend to the satisfaction of the lusts and desires of the flesh. Ga 5:24. The spiritually minded, on the other hand, dwell on that which is of the Spirit, τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, the things, works, fruits of the

Spirit, as they are specified, for example, in Ga 5:22. Self-evidently, then, the carnally minded walk according to the flesh, the spiritually minded according to the Spirit. Out of man's fashion and nature arises the attitude, and the attitude manifests itself in works and conduct. "For to be carnally minded is dead, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." Here the "for," γάρ, is to be taken explicatively. The mind of the flesh, like that of the Spirit, is still more closely characterized. τὸ φρόνημα does not mean the thing striven for, but according to Grimm and Schierlitz, as also in the classics, the striving, the disposition, studium (desire), "the imagination of man's heart." The aims and endeavors of the flesh are, in the last analysis, directed toward, carnal joys and pleasures finally bring death to man. Cf. 6:21. The thoughts and aims of the Spirit, on the other hand, are directed toward life and salvation. "Life," ζώή, is here, in contrast to death, eternal life, and correspondingly εἰρήνη is the completed salvation, as in 2:10. Cf. 6:22. Life and salvation do not have their real cause in the spiritual mind and striving, although the spiritual life continues on in eternal life. The spiritual life, which spontaneously grows out of the saving faith or sanctification is not the causa regnandi (cause of salvation), but really the via regni (the way of salvation). Thus flesh and spirit are differentiated from one another, as far as death and life.

Διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν "Because the mind set on the flesh is hostile toward God," v. 7. That is the real mind of the flesh, the root of the carnal disposition, namely, enmity against God. The carnal-minded contrive the works of the flesh, exactly insofar and on that account, because the same are evil, ungodly, and contrary to God. This inimical mind shows itself in the fact that the flesh, for ἡ σὰρξ, the principal subject of the discussion, and not τὸ φρόνημα is the subject of οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται which does not subject itself to the Law of God. If the Law of God enters into the natural man and prohibits and criticizes the fleshly desires, then the flesh sets itself against that and contradicts and strives against God and the will of God with all its powers. "For it is not even able to do so." The form and nature of the flesh brings with itself that it cannot be subject to the Law of God. "And those who are in the flesh cannot please God." Οἱ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες, those whose entire being is resolved in the flesh, who live and move in the flesh as their element and are thereby hostile to God and resist the Law of God, cannot possibly please God. But they draw God's displeasure, God's enmity and wrath and thus also death down upon themselves. Thus with the sentence structure in vv. 7-8 the statement in v. 6a is proved, that the mentality of the flesh is death.

The statement in Ro 8:7: Τὸ πρὸνυμα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν "the mind set on the flesh is hostile toward God," has become in the Lutheran Church a salient dictum probans (approving of things) for the doctrine of the complete and basic corruption of man. Luther remarks on the point: "'The carnal mind' is that one asks nothing about God, or considers nothing about Him and understands nothing thereof, contempt of God, unbelief, disobedience, evil lusts and striving against God's Commandment. To such Paul gives the title and name, that 'the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.' That is the stem and root of all other sins and especially of the distressing original sin of Adam in Paradise. If this had not been, then there would never be any thievery, murder, adultery, etc. Now the world really sees such outwardly evil things, yes, wonders and complains about them that the people are so evil, but it does not know how it happens. They see the rivulet flow and burst forth in all sorts of leaves and fruits of the evil tree; but whence the spring comes forth and where the root hides they know not." Cf. Eberle, Luthers Epistelauslegung, pp. 122-123. The Formula of Concord confesses in the II Article on the basis of Ro 8:7-8, "that the unregenerate will of man is not only turned away from God, but also has become an enemy of God, so that it only has the desire and will for that which is evil and contrary to God." Mueller, *Symb. B.*, p. 523-24, (Triglotta, p. 787). The Apology proves from Ro 8:7-8 and similar passages, that man by nature cannot love God, that the apparently good works of natural man are worthless before God.

These testimonies are so manifest that, to use the words of Augustine which he employed in this case, they do not need an acute understanding but only an attentive hearer. If the carnal mind is enmity against God, the flesh certainly does not love God. If it cannot be subject to the Law of God, it cannot love God. If the carnal mind is enmity against God, the flesh sins, even when we do external civil works. If it cannot be subject to the Law of God, it certainly sins, even when, according to human judgment, it possesses deeds that are excellent and worthy of praise. (Triglotta, p. 129)

It appears from Ro 8:7, as the Formula of Concord writes: "That the free will from its own natural powers, not only cannot work or cooperate in working anything for its own conversion, righteousness and salvation, nor follow (obey), believe, or assent to the Holy Ghost, who through the Gospel offers him grace and salvation, but from its innate, wicked, rebellious nature it resists God and His will hostilely, unless it be enlightened and controlled by God's Spirit." (Triglotta, pp. 887-89.) Yes, all Synergism, also the modern theory that the natural, unconverted man, possesses the ability to decide for God and Christ by virtue of the so called arbitrium liberatum (free judgment), or with the help of

the so-called preliminary grace to discontinue the so-called wanton resistance, is punished as lies by the word of Scripture, Ro 8:7: "Because the mind set on the flesh is hostile toward God." For such an ability would presuppose a neutral attitude and the use of this ability in bonam partem would presuppose a certain friendliness over against God in unconverted man. No, the natural man resists God, namely totis viribus, wherever God declares Himself to him. He resists both the Law of God and the Gospel of God, and can do nothing else; his nature permits nothing else. Only God, by His creative power and grace, can change the perverted direction of the will, which is closely joined together with the nature of man. And that God does when He converts sinful man. There out of unwilling, resisting ones He makes willing ones, out of enemies, friends. And as soon as the resistant has yielded in a little, as soon as man leans toward God and His Gospel only with the slightest longing of his heart, then he is converted. But as far as the regenerated still has the flesh in himself, he also still finds in himself, he also still finds in himself the natural, obstinate mind. The struggle of the Christian with his own flesh and blood is essentially a struggle with the inborn enmity against God.

In that the Apostle now turns again to the other side, he no longer speaks objectively of those who are according to or in the Spirit, but applies what he would say further concerning the πνευματικοὺς directly to the Christian readers. In v. 9 he writes: "However, you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit," your life is bound in the Spirit. You live and move in the Spirit, if "indeed," εἴτερ , and that Paul assumes in all his readers, "that the Spirit of God dwells in you!" The Spirit of God, who has regenerated the Christians, now dwells in the Christians. The Spirit of God Himself dwells personally, not only with His power and effect. The Apostle adds: "Now if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, does not belong to Him." Now by that he does not refer to the manifest non-Christians, but to the seeming Christians. Many a one who still is not a Christian, makes the claim that he also belongs to Christ, because he does not have the Spirit of Christ. Therefore in these words there lies an earnest challenge to all Christians to examine themselves, whether their Christianity is genuine. The Spirit of God is here called the Spirit of Christ, because He proceeds and is sent, as from the Father, so from the Son, and because He applies Christ's work and benefit to the individual. Cf. 1 John 3:24: "And we know by this that He abides in us, by the Spirit whom He has given us." The point to which the Apostle would come is given in v. 10: "And if Christ is in you, though the body is dead because of sin; yet the spirit is alive because of righteousness." One

should perhaps expect the following continuation: "but if the Spirit of Christ is in you, then," etc. But the Spirit brings Christ with Him, through the Spirit the Son, like the Father, dwells in our hearts, John 14:23. Thus if the Spirit and therewith also Christ is in us, as this is certainly the case in all believing Christians, then the other factor also applies, that the body is certainly dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. The body is dead, νεκρόν . That is a stronger expression than θνητόν , v. 11. Bengel: νεκρόν magna vi, mortis adjudicatum deditumque (very forcibly; adjudged and given to death). Our body is, as it were, a corpse. The body is dead, already in the time of life, because it bears in itself the seed of death and dies from day to day, until death has completely swallowed up that life. That, however, has its cause in sin, δι' ἁμαρτίαν . Because sin, sin in general, has come into the world, already, already because of Adam's sin, as Acts 5:12ff. has explained it. The entire race of man has succumbed to death. Christians do not escape this general fate of death through the new birth. They still have mortal bodies; they must die like all the children of men. "Yet the Spirit is alive because of righteousness," τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην . Τὸ πνεῦμα is here, in contrast to σῶμα , evidently the human spirit, the inner essence of man, who consists of body and soul. ζωή , in contrast to the death of the body, is immortal life, eternal life. The Christians, in whom Christ and His Spirit live, have according to their spirit a share in eternal life and already now have a foretast of eternal life. The Spirit of God, who dwells in them, ἀπαρχή , a first-fruit of the future world, 8:23. This life, however, has its foundation in righteousness. With Rueckert, Fritzsche, Meyer, Philippi, Hofmann, Luthardt, Godet and most of the ancients we understand under δικαιοσύνη , which is absolutely contrasted to sin, the absolute and perfect righteousness, the righteousness κατεξοχήν , which is for all times present in Christ. The righteousness of life is a cause of life: that is an un-Pauline, unscriptural thought. That life, the salvation flows from righteousness, from justification, - that the Apostle demonstrated in detail in Ro 5. The Christians have become partakers of eternal life through the faith of the righteousness which avails before God, and with that already according to the soul and according to the beginnings are partakers of eternal life. In the foregoing context, where the Apostle describes eternal life as a goal, end and issue of spiritual life, it was clearly indicated, that it should be pointed out again. Eternal life is certainly originally based simply and alone in the objective righteousness, in the righteousness of Christ, so that no one might build the certainty of his salvation on his imperfect

sanctification.

V. 11 continues: εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν οἴκετ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσεται καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν "But if the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through His Spirit who indwells you." With the δὲ μεταβατικόν the Apostle goes on from that which he had said concerning the spirit of the Christians to a statement which he refers to their body. The principal clause of this verse asserts that God also shall quicken our mortal bodies, ζωοποιήσεται. That is say that at one time He will take the same from death and transfer them into true life, the spiritual, divine being and life, into the life of glorification. Cp. 1 Cor 15:23, 35ff., where the ζωοποιεῖν is more clearly explained by the fact that we shall receive a σῶμα πνευματικόν. The God who shall quicken our mortal bodies is here designated as the One who has raised up Christ from the dead, ὁ ἐγείρας τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. But intentionally Paul uses the name Χριστός here, while he shortly before had written Ἰησοῦ. Χριστός is the Mediator of salvation. Christ died for our benefit and rose for our benefit. He is the firstfruits of them that sleep, 1 Cor 15:20. He Himself rose and entered into the life of glorification and has prepared the resurrection and the life, the life of glorification for us. We should become partakers of His resurrection, of His glory. Our vile bodies should become similar to His glorified body, Php 3:21. Our resurrection and glorification have their foundation in the resurrection of Christ from the dead. And therefore God who raised Christ from the dead will certainly also give life to our mortal bodies. This fact of the future, however, is deduced in our verse from the fact expressed in the protasis, Εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα etc., from the fact that the Spirit of Him, who has raised Jesus from the dead, dwells in us. These facts of the case of the present guarantee that fact of the future. The Spirit of Him who has raised up Jesus, the Spirit of God, who quickens the dead, dwells in our hearts. The spirit has inwardly, according to the soul, already made us partakers of life and the imperishable existence. Our spirit is already life, as we have read in v. 10. And therefore God, who has given His Spirit into our hearts, who with the work of ζωοποιήσας has already made the beginning, shall certainly also complete His work, He shall also quicken our mortal bodies, lead them over into the life in which the glorified Christ, our Savior and Redeemer, now already stands. The beginning guarantees the end. Cf. Eph 1:14, where the Spirit of God, who dwells in the Christians, is called the "earnest," ἀρραβών,

of our inheritance, of our future redemption. Both things are highly comforting for us Christians, who according to the body still lie and groan under the power of death. First, we know that God has raised Christ from the dead. In the resurrection of Christ, our Savior, this fact of the future, our resurrection, has already been established and given. Secondly, we know that God through Christ, has sent and given His Holy Spirit, in whom we possess a security, an earnest of our future resurrection. The closing part of the 11. verse reads differently in the different codices. A¹ ABC offer the reading: δὲ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν . On the other hand, DEFGI, as also the ancient church fathers and most old translations, have the accusative: δὲ τὸν ἐνοικοῦν etc. Most modern expositors rightly adopt the latter reading, and that for internal reasons. The thought that δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος , quickens the dead through the Spirit is without biblical analogy. On the other hand, the δὲ τὸν ἐνοικοῦν etc., in the understanding, "um des willen, dass sein Geist in euch wohnt" (Luther) "by his Spirit that dwelleth in you," A.V. corresponds to the protasis, Εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα...οἴκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν , and brings its content once more to special emphasis.

The spiritual life of the Christians, the Spirit of God and of Christ, who dwells in the Christians, is directed at life eternal, and likewise also at the glorification of our mortal bodies. That is the summary of vv. 9-11. And so this passage, vv. 9-11, evidently serves as a proof for v. 6b: Τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη "but the mind set on the spirit is life and peace," the same as by the preceding passage, vv. 7-8, the first part of the 6 verse was proved. The double statement in v. 6 accordingly governs the entire section, vv. 5-11. And the fact which is here brought into prominence that the mind of the flesh is death. The mind of the spirit, on the other hand, is life and salvation, is a motive for the Christians, that they walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit. This is the meaning of γάρ , v. 5.

Vv. 12-17

After the Apostle has shown what the actual circumstances of Christians are, he adds an admonition, similar to the admonition in 6:12-14 which he added to the description of the Christian condition, 6:3-11. The words ὀφειλέται ἐσμέν οὐ τῇ σαρκί "we are under obligation not to the flesh," v. 12, do not contain an admonition formally, but according to the sense and content. Habet autem haec conclusio vim exhortationis, quemadmodum semper a doctrina exhortationem solet deducere. (The conclusion has the force of an exhortation as it is always cus-

tomary to deduce an exhortation from a doctrine), Calvin. We Christians are not debtors to the flesh. "The natural man presumes that he is obligated to grant satisfaction to his flesh," Hofmann. The Christian also thinks this, insofar as the flesh still clings to him. Therefore, the Christians should know that they owe no consideration to the flesh, that they have no obligation over against the flesh. The infinitive clause τοῦ κατὰ σαρκὰ ζῆν "to live according to the flesh," does not depend directly on ὀφειλέται. Winer and Fritzsche incorrectly accept it, according to the construction ὀφειλέτης τινός, since ὀφειλέται has its object in the preceding dative τῇ σαρκί, but is an independent sentence with a "purposive" meaning. The condition of guilt over against the flesh, if such a thing existed, would aim at the purpose that we live according to the flesh and that we give way to the flesh in all matters. Precisely against that, Paul wants all Christians to be warned. Through the address "Brethren" he seeks to move the readers to a more willing acceptance of this warning and admonition. This he relates by means of Ἄρα οὖν out of the preceding section, vv. 1-11, namely from the principal thought, which had been brought forth very strongly at the close of v. 11: that the Christians through the Spirit are freed from the law of sin and of the flesh, that the Spirit of God dwells in them. And now he points again, as already previously in vv. 5-11, to the unhappy consequences of a life according to the flesh, in order to deter the Christian from a carnal way of life: εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν "for if you are living according to the flesh, you must die," v. 13a. In this case that is the lot designated for you, from which you shall not escape. Under the dying here, as under θάνατος, 8:6, 6:21, death is to be understood in the repeatedly presented full sense of the word. The Christians should not think that it would not hurt them so much, if they let the flesh do as it pleases just because they are Christians. No, if they fall back into the service of the flesh, they have nothing else to expect than death and condemnation as all servants of the flesh. The position of the οὐ before τῇ σαρκί, not before ὀφειλέται, already has pointed to the fact that the Apostle at the same time has the opposite in mind, namely, life according to the Spirit. And this he brings out expressly in v. 13b: εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε "but if by the Spirit you are putting to death the deeds of the body, you will live." The life of the Spirit shows itself first of all and above all in the mortification of the flesh. By the power of the Spirit of God, who dwells in them, the Christians can and should mortify the flesh. But Paul writes not τὰς πράξεις τῆς σαρκός, "the deeds of the flesh," but τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος

"the deeds of the body." The latter is the predominantly attested reading. And τὸ σῶμα designates here (as little as elsewhere) body and soul, and is also not synonymous with σὰρξ "flesh." Τὸ σῶμα is simply the body with its members, and αἱ πράξεις τοῦ σώματος are the actions or the works of the body. The body, however, here comes into consideration, as in 6:12, as an organ of sin and of the flesh, which seek to carry out their will through the members of the body. And now, if the flesh wants to activate body and members, then the Christians - by the power of the Spirit should immediately step in and nip the actions of the body in the bud, before they become fulfilled works, ἔργα . Thereby they then put to death and crucify the flesh with its lusts and desires, Ga 5:24. And if they do that, then they shall live and receive life in the full sense of the word, eternal life. To live after the flesh means death. Mortification of the flesh, on the other hand, is the way to life. Certainly eternal life is and remains under all circumstances a free, undeserved gift of God, which comes to us only because of Christ. If we however live and walk according to the flesh, if we fail to mortify the flesh, then we sacrifice and lose this gift.

It is easy to recognize how the second part of the section, introduced with γάρ , the passage vv. 14-17, is joined to the first part. The connection of thought is simple and plain. The statement, to which the remainder, resp. the admonition, vv. 12-13, had come: "But if by the Spirit you are putting to death the deeds of the body, you will live," is thereby established. Those whom the Spirit of God moves are children of God. Children are heirs, thus children of God are heirs of eternal life.

The argumentation begins in v. 14 with the words: Ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι ἐστὶν υἱοὶ θεοῦ "For all who are being led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God." The Apostle had remarked in v. 9, that whoever does not have the Spirit of Christ is none of his. Only those who have the Spirit of Christ are in truth those who belong to Christ, namely, Christians. The Holy Spirit, who dwells in the hearts of the Christians, however, is never idle, but always busy and active. He urges, leads and rules the Christians. The mortification of the flesh, of which v. 13 had spoken, is a special work of the Spirit. Where this is found, there the Spirit has His work. The Spirit of God moves and urges the Christians, draws and holds them away from the evil, from the works of the flesh, and leads them into all good works. The matter is the same, whether it says that the Christians mortify the flesh, resp. (do good by the power of the Spirit,) or, that the Spirit leads them, - or whether the Christian is introduced as the subject. The Holy Spirit works all good in the Christians, but this

action and urging of the Holy Spirit, is, as our Confession emphasizes, not a coactio (coercion). The Spirit of God operates here through the renewed self or through the renewed will of the regenerated. And so one can ascribe the works of the Spirit also to the renewed self of the Christian. The Spirit of God is and remains the real subjectum movens et agens (acting and moving of the subject). Christians by the Spirit of God, fight and overcome sin and flesh and do and fulfill with pleasure and joy that which is pleasing to God. And now it says that as many as are led by the Spirit of God, those and only those, οὗτοι, are God's children. Here for the first time in our Letter the Apostle designates the Christians as sons, as children of God. He uses the expression υἱοὶ θεοῦ evidently in the same sense as the expression υἱοθεσία in v. 14, thus as a designation of our position and relationship to God. We Christians are and appear before God as children, and God is our Father and shows and gives Himself to us as a Father. We have become justified before God through faith in Christ, so that God has a heartfelt pleasure in us. That fact Paul had presented in detail in the first part of the Letter. That can also be expressed thus, that we have become children of God through faith in Christ Jesus, Ga 3:26. In our passage, however, the Apostle calls special attention to the fact, that those whom the Spirit of God leads are children of God. That the Spirit leads them does not first make them into children, but proves them as children of God. Of those who are led by the Spirit of God are surely accounted as children of God. οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κρᾶζομεν ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ· αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ "For you have not received a spirit of slavery leading to fear again, but you have received a spirit of adoption as sons by which we cry out Abba! Father! The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God" vv. 15-16. A similar expression of Paul is found in Ga 4:6: "which would say, as a proof thereof, that you are children. And because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!'" Here the Apostle proves by the receiving of the Spirit that we are children of God. In our passage he stresses that as many as are led by the Spirit of God those are certainly children of God. They are that; for the Spirit who leads and moves them is a Spirit of adoption. This argumentation includes that the πνεῦμα, of whom the discussion is in v. 15, is the same πνεῦμα as the one mentioned in v. 14 and v. 16. It is the Spirit of God, as also most expositors take it, and not, as, for example, Grotius, de Wette and Philippi would, as a subjective human attitude, "Geistesstimmung mood." To this

latter interpretation one sees oneself forced, if one finds a double distinguished in v. 15. By that could be meant only the difference between "servile spirit" and "childlike spirit." But the Apostle does not write οὐ γὰρ πάλιν ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας. Thus he says nothing of a spirit of bondage, which the readers had previously received, but he places the πάλιν before εἰς φόβον. Throughout this section he speaks of the one Spirit, which the readers had received when they became Christians. He speaks of the Spirit of God, and denies first of all in v. 15, that this Spirit is a spirit of bondage. If He were that, then the Christians must certainly fear again, be afraid and terrified before God, as previously, when they were in servitude under the Law. The Spirit of God, who is in the Christians, is not a spirit of bondage, but a Spirit of adoption. Δουλείας designates the condition of a servant, and υἱοθεσία means first of all adoption and then the relationship of a child established through adoption, the condition of a child. So also Ro 9,4; Eph 1,5. The genitives δουλείας and υἱοθεσίας are genitives of the characteristic attribute. And now why the Spirit, which the Christians have received, is called adoption, is shown by the relative clause: ἐν ᾧ κρίζομεν· Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ. . We Christians cry: Abba, Father. As often as we draw near to God and pray to Him, we speak with comfort and all confidence: Abba, beloved Father. The Aramaic name of God, Abba, has passed over into the New Testament Greek language of prayer. "The ardor of the feeling of adoption," as Meyer correctly remarks, urged the Hellenistic Christians to repeat the name of the Father in their mother tongue. But that we thus place ourselves over against God and pray, as to our beloved Father we do (ἐν ᾧ) by the power of the Spirit of God. The Spirit whom we have received invites and leads us to prayer, and particularly to such childlike, confident praying. And to what extent He does that, what mood of the Spirit the cry of Abba produces in us is stated by the following clause, which is therefore added "without conjunction," because he further explains the ἐν ᾧ, ἐν ᾧ κρίζομεν· Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐσμεν τέκνα θεοῦ. "The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God" v. 16. With Luther we understand συμμαρτυρεῖν as "witness" not as co-witness. The σύν often serves in compositis (in agreement) only for the strengthening of the concept. In Ro 9:1 only "the witness of the conscience" is in place, not the "co-witness." Our spirit cannot properly be called "witness," at whose side then would stand the witness of the Spirit of God. Our spirit, out of whose inner parts the cry of Father rings forth, is not a witness which makes

certain the adoption, but is made sure of the adoption, in that it is received from another, a greater witness. It is the Spirit of God alone who renders authentic, demonstrative testimony. He gives us certainty, divine certainty of the fact that we are the children of God. He is the Spirit of the Son of God, who has merited the adoption for us, Ga 4:6. The testimony of the Spirit of God is entirely independent of our own deliberations and feelings. We then perceive this witness in our spirit, if we are tempted to err regarding the fatherly mind of God. It hardly needs the remark that this witness of the Spirit, as the receiving of the Spirit Himself and all effects of the Spirit, is mediated by "the preaching of faith" Ga 3:5. The Gospel of Christ testifies to us repeatedly and emphatically, in manifold ways, that we are beloved children of God and that God's father-heart stands open to us always. The Spirit of God makes this Word alive in our hearts, through this Word itself. This word personally speaks to our hearts and persuades and convinces us that we are really and truly children, and not servants of God. In this manner, through such testimony, He entices and calls forth out of our hearts the cry of Abba. Therefore one can also say of the Spirit, as it reads in Ga 4:6, that He cries, Abba, Father. The Spirit of God is thus a Spirit not of bondage but of adoption. When therefore the Spirit of God makes Himself alive and active upon and in us, as in the mortification of the works of the flesh, then that is a certain proof for the fact that we are the children of God.

But then the ζήσεσθε of v. 13 also applies: εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν "And if children, heirs also, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ; if indeed we suffer with Him, in order that we may also be glorified with Him," v. 17. Cp. Ga 4:7: "Therefore you are no longer a slave, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God." According to divine and human laws children are heirs. They have a claim on the property of their fathers and shall receive the same in their time. Children of God are heirs of God. They have a claim on the good which God has intended for His children, and they are joint heirs with Christ. They shall receive the inheritance which Christ, the first-born Brother, had taken already at the beginning. And this inheritance is eternal life, v. 13, or the heavenly glory (συνδοξασθῶμεν), into which Christ has already entered through suffering and death. They shall certainly then be partakers of the glory of Christ only when they previously suffer with Christ, willingly and patiently take upon themselves all the disagreeable conditions which befall them for Christ's sake. Passiones non conditio sunt meritoria, sed ordo,

quem Deus in hominibus ad aeternam haereditatem admittendis constituit et observat.
Causa enim unica constituta erat υἱοθεσία vel adaptio. (Sufferings are not a meritorious condition, but the order which God establishes and observes in admitting men into the eternal inheritance. The only cause established is υἱοθεσία sonship or adoption), Calov. This last thought leads over to the following section. Therefore the Apostle in the foregoing section employs the comforting article of the adoption of God and the inheritance of eternal life. He does this to urge the Christians to mortify the flesh and to live after the Spirit.

We can summarize the rich content of the entire section, 8:1-17, in the following statement:

The Apostle reminds the Christians that the Spirit of God dwells in them and that they are therefore obligated to live after the Spirit, who guarantees to them the adoption and the heavenly inheritance. He warns them earnestly against walking according to the flesh, so that they do not die and suffer condemnation.

8:18-39: Comfort in Suffering.

Vv. 18-22

The Apostle had closed the previous section with the words: "If indeed we suffer with Him in order that we may also be glorified with Him." Patient suffering is also a part of sanctification. And now from v. 18 on the Apostle brings encouragement, which should make the Christians determine to take the cross of Christ upon themselves willingly. Comfort in our trials is the principal content of the second half of the 8 chapter. And therefore Paul then gives the Christians to consider that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy (to be compared with) the future glory. He calls the sufferings which the Christians experience for the sake of Christ τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ "the sufferings of the present time." These belong to the present time, the time of this world, and thus cease, when this world ends. He does not say τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, but τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ. The present time of suffering is a quickly-passing, short period of time. That is already a comfort for the suffering Christians. Thus Peter also comforted the cross-bearers by the fact that ". . . even though now for a little while, if necessary, you have been distressed by various trials," 1 Pe 1:6. The real statement in our passage, points to the fact that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy of comparison with the coming glory, οὐκ ἄξια πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς "are not worthy with the glory that is to be revealed to us." Ἀξιον is quod lancem trahit (is the word which carries the burden). When one lays the sufferings of this time into the one balance

scale, the future glory into the other, then the first quickly rises. The sufferings of the present time are of no great importance, they are of no consequence in comparison to the glory which shall be revealed in us. For that is an eternal, boundless, inexpressibly great glory. This glory is now already present in Christ. On that day He shall return in all His glory. But this glory, which is now hidden, shall be revealed, on that day. It is designated for us, εἰς ἡμᾶς ; we should and shall be partakers of the same, even be glorified with Christ. This sentence, in which he compares the present suffering with the future glory, the Apostle introduces with the words: λογίζομαι γάρ, ὅτι. . On his part he had done more and suffered more than all the Apostles. But in his severe suffering he had been richly comforted and had then had a deep look into the promised glory. Cf. 2 Cor 1:11-12. Thus he knew from experience what the cross of Christ is, and could therefore give such judgment and thereby summon his readers to decide whether this evaluation of the Christian suffering is not correct. A parallel to Ro 8:18 is 2 Cor 4:17: Τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρόν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν "For momentary, light affliction is producing for us an eternal weight of glory far beyond all comparison."

The γάρ in v. 19, by means of which the following statement is joined to v. 18, we refer to the principal expression contained in the predicate of the 19 verse and not to some modifier of the same. We do not find in the following sentence the certainty (thus, for example, DeWette, Fritzsche, Meyer), still less the futurity (thus, for example, Philippi), but with most exegetes the greatness of the glory established, which shall be revealed to us. That is the thing that lies nearest and with that the content of the following verses agrees. The Apostle speaks in the same verses of the κτίσις and understands under that, as most of the ancient and modern expositors have correctly recognized, the irrational creatures, the animate and inanimate, namely, that which we generally call nature. He places the κτίσις "the creature," along side the children of God, who form a part of humanity. Thus he has in mind the creatures, which make up the surroundings of man. We confess this in the First Article: "I believe that God has made me and all creatures." He states that the creatures wait for the manifestation of the children of God, which means, that the children of God shall be revealed as that which they are. That takes place, when the glory shall be revealed and the children of God shall be clothed with the same. The ἀπὸ in ἀπεκδέχεται "has, as in ἀποθαρεῖν "to have full confidence," ἀποθαυμάζειν "to marvel much," ἀπομένειν "to remain behind," the sense that

one is quite beside oneself, is completely consumed in something," (Hofmann). This does not correspond to the German "Abwarten" "waiting for," so that one waits until the expectation is fulfilled. For in v. 22 Paul gives the συντενάζειν "groaning," which falls together with the waiting, the modifier ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν "until now," and not perhaps ἄχρι τοῦ τέλους . Thus he speaks here of that which is the case from the beginning to the present time, and does not reflect further on the fact that this continues on to the end. In this poetic passage the Apostle personifies the creature, in that he ascribes to it a waiting. Then, in order to strengthen his statement, he still further personifies this waiting, in that he expresses himself thus: ἡ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως...ἀπεκδέχεται

"the anxious longing of the creation . . . waits." Καραδοκεῖν means: with outstretched neck, thus to look into the distance with strain and longing. The ἀπό here has the same sense as in ἀπεκδέχεται . The irrational creature thus looks out with strain and expectation for the revelation of the children of God, like an event decisive for itself. What the final revelation of the children of God to signify for the creatures, appears in the following.

This present status quo (the state in which anything is; the state existing), the hoping and waiting of the creatures, has its foundation in a factor of the past, to which the Apostle points in v. 20: τῇ γὰρ ματαλότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἐκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐφ' ἐλπίδι "For the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will, but because of Him who subjected it, in hope." The creatures have been subjected to the ματαλότης, to vanity. Everything earthly vanishes, blooms for a short time and fades and withers and becomes dust. "Everywhere we have pictures of death and disappearance before our eyes; the plagues of unfruitfulness, the raging of the elements, the destructive power of the wild animals, the laws themselves which govern the plant life. Everything gives nature a gloomy appearance," Reuss. That was not so from the very beginning. All creation having come forth from God's creative hand, bore in itself the force, the power and the law of life. But then an event soon took place, which changed the original condition of things. Since that time creation has succumbed to vanity. Or rather, it is subject to the same, ὑπετάγη "was subjected," as subjected with power, οὐχ ἐκοῦσα "not of its own will," against its will. Its own nature resists: "by reason of him who has subjected the same," because another one has so desired and decided. He who gave the creature over to perishableness is God, the Lord of creation. Paul has in mind the judgment of God in Gn 3:17, where God spoke to Adam: "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree about which I commanded

you, saying, You shall not eat from it; Cursed is the ground because of you; In toil you shall eat of it; All the days of your life." Man had sinned with knowledge and will, he wanted the evil which God had expressly forbidden, and thereby wanted his death and condemnation. On account of man God delivered also the creature to curse, death and destruction. The emphasis, however, in the statement in v. 20 lies on the final modifier ἐπ' ἐλπίδου "in hope," which one most fittingly combines with the verbum finitum (finite words), ὑπετάγη . God placed the curse of sin also upon the creature, permitting the innocent creatures to suffer with the guilty man. He had in view a future change of this disparity, so that the suffering creatures could hope for a change and improvement of their condition.

What the creature has to expect is further amplified in v. 21: ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ "that the creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the children of God." We do not take this sentence, which is introduced with ὅτι , as an object clause to ἐπ' ἐλπίδου , in the sense, "in hope that," etc., as, for example, Meyer would do, for ἐπ' ἐλπίδου is an adverbial phrase. But we translate ὅτι with "for," "because the creature itself also, will be set free," etc., and take this expression as a modifier of ἐπ' ἐλπίδου . That ὅτι is thus used in an explicative sense is proven by such passages as 1 Cor 1:25. According to the matter on hand it arrives at the same point, if one, as other expositors do, finds the principal statement in v. 20, ὑπετάγη ἐν ἐλπίδου confirmed by the sentence of the 21 verse. In any case here, in v. 21, the great change to which God has subjected it in vanity, is more closely described. All creation, like the children of God, shall be freed from the servitude of corruption. φθορά is a stronger expression for "perishableness," which had previously been designated as ματαιότης . The genitive, τῆς φθορᾶς and τῆς δόξης are taken most suitably as genitive of apposition. Ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς is the servitude which consists in corruption. The creature, because it is subjected to the ματαιότης , finds itself in a condition of servitude, in that the general vanishing and corruption is something strange. Out of this condition of servitude the creature shall one day be translated into a more adequate condition for it, into the opposite condition. It shall be delivered to the freedom of the glory of the children of God, εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξας τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ . When Christ comes again in His glory, the children of God shall become partakers of

His glory. And when the children of God are then glorified and transfigured, then they will have accomplished the fullest freedom. Their glory is at the same time freedom. They will follow entirely their own inclination, the inclination of the new, divine nature, which they have received in regeneration. They will serve their God and Father, and praise and magnify God in all eternity. They will do this with a free and joyful spirit, untroubled and unhindered by sin, weakness and death, with all the powers of body and soul. The creature shall and will receive a share in the freedom and glory of the children of God. As they are now laden with the shame and the curse of sinful mankind, thus they shall then come to honor with perfected, transfigured mankind. All traces of perishableness and of death shall then be removed. The creature shall then be revealed as that which it is, a creation of God. They shall live, move and act in conformity with their own power in their own nature in the service of God, their Creator. They shall reflect still more purely and beautifully than it was in the beginning. This great change, which all creation shall experience, includes in itself the continuation beyond the end of the world. Still that does not contradict such statements of Scripture as 2 Pe 3:10-12. There it is only taught that the presently existing world shall dissolve in the fire. "The disappearance of the world is the disappearance of its form (1Cor 7:31), by which its transformation is conditioned," Meyer. "Not the κόσμος, but only the σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου shall disappear. 1 Cor 7:31. The fire of 2 Pe 3:10 is to be considered as a fire of purification and not of annihilation." Philippi. Out of the fire of the earth, shall the new creation come forth rejuvenated and transfigured. Out of them shall come the new heaven and the new earth, in which dwells righteousness. 2 Pe 3:13.

What the Apostle has to say concerning the creature he closes with the words: Οὐδ' αὖτε γὰρ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν "For we know that the whole creation groans and suffers the pains of childbirth together until now," v. 22. By means of γὰρ this sentence joins itself to the principal statement of the section, vv. 19-22, namely, that the creature waits for and expects the revelation of the children of God. As already remarked, Paul here personifies the creature. A real conscious waiting, expecting, hoping cannot be ascribed to the irrational, senseless creature. What the Apostle has in mind with this poetic description of the nature is the fact that a great change and a glorious future is imminent. That is a truth which God has revealed in this place through His Apostle to the suffering Christians, who need comfort. We must

accept simply in faith this element of divine truth. Still we ourselves can perceive something of that, if we look into nature. We know the Apostle writes that we can observe it ourselves. The whole creation groans and moans, *συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει* , and indeed *ἄρχη τοῦ νῦν* , from the beginning, that is, since it was subjected to the *παταλότης* , even until now. *ἰδῶνες* are the pains of birth and then in general sever pains. It is questionable whether in our passage the expression *ὠδίνειν* points to the fact that "the old *κτίσις* , as it were, is exerting itself amid severe pains to bring forth out of itself the new *κτίσις* ," Philippi. The *σύν* in both verbis (words) designates, as, for example, also Philippi, Meyer, Weiss, Hofmann and Luthardt accept it, gemitum et dolorem communem inter se partium creaturae (The groaning and general pain of nature in giving birth). "The whole creation performs, as it were, a great symphony of groaning." Philippi. We can become aware of that in some measure with our senses, and so we know something about it. What first of all meets our eyes is the *παταλότης* and *φθορά* , into which the creature has fallen. But if we consider nature more attentively, then we perceive "that their collective life passes through a pain of anxious wrestling which demonstrates itself in their expressions of life, with continuous perils of death." Hofmann. Wherever we turn, there we discover how the creature struggles against the disappearance and corruption, and that he experiences pain over it. The worm wiggles in the dust, when it is stepped on. The animals for slaughter turn and howl under the sacrificial knife. Whoever understands how to listen to the expressions of life of nature, receives either a loud cry of lament and woe or a muffled whimper, complaint and groan. "Does not a common cry of pain or a painful moaning break forth continually in all life in nature? Has not the ear of the poet heard this great cry of complaint in all ages? Has not his mouth always granted to nature expression again? As Schelling once said: On a beautiful spring day, when nature unfolds all her charms, does not the heart absorb a poison of gnawing melancholy, while it drinks in admiration?" Godet. All this we see and hear, feel and experience; that we know from our own observation. Now we should know and believe what the Apostle attests. Thus the Apostle applies the *συστενάζειν* and *συνωδίνειν* of the *κτίσις* , that the pains and lament of the creature is a yearning and lament of pining. The creature desires itself out of its misery and corruption and with tension and desire looks out for a better future, to the glory of the children of God. Thus in the lamentation and groaning, which we perceive, the waiting and watching of creation for the revelation of the children of God proves itself. And because the whole creation is in such a manner looking for and moving toward

the freedom of the glory of the children of God, is a proof for the greatness of this glory. Because everything around us strives toward the same glorious goal, toward which we Christians reach out in hope, we can and should conclude what a beautiful inheritance awaits us there.

The acceptance of a future change and glorification of the creature, is found throughout in the church fathers, among most Lutheran and Reformed theologians of the 16 century. Examples of this are found with Luther, Melanchthon, with Koerner, the co-author of the Formula of Concord, and Brenz, in their commentaries of the Letter to the Romans, in the old Bible works, like the Altenburger, and finally with the great majority of orthodox exegetes of modern times. The dogmaticians of the 17 century, who interpret the freedom of the creature from the servitude of perishableness as an annihilation of the creature, in that they appeal especially to 2 Pe 3, must do violence to the words of Paul. *Εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν* "into the freedom," v. 21, cannot possibly be a designation of time in the sense: "At the time, when the freedom of the glory of the children of God enters in." The double modifiers of *ἐλευθερωθήσεται*, which are introduced with *ἀπὸ* and *εἰς*, mark significantly the translation of the creature out of one condition into another. And why should the fire, of which Peter writes, be taken throughout as a fire of annihilation? No earthly fire is a fire of annihilation in the real sense of the word, in which it completely annihilates the substance. The fire of hell does not terminate the existence of the condemned. Thus also the effect of the fire of the last day is not necessarily a redactio in nihilum. The dissolving of the old heaven and the old earth in fire corresponds rather to the death, decay and dissolving of the human body, which shall be made alive again out of the dust. We record here finally several quotations from the renowned sermons of Luther on the Epistle of the Fourth Sunday after Trinity. "Thus St. Paul makes out of all suffering on earth a little drop and a small spark; but out of that glory, for which we should hope, an endless sea and a great fire." "If our parents in paradise had not sinned, the world would never have perished. But after they had fallen into sin and all of us after them, the whole creation must also suffer for us. It is now also subject to vanity and destruction because of our sins. For 6000 years, which are nothing over against eternal life, these have remained subject to the condemned world and served it with all its advantages. This will remain until God shall push them into a heap (as St. Peter's Second Epistle, 3:3, also teaches) and shall purify and renew the creation also for the sake of the elect. For the sun has now been nowhere so beautiful, bright, and clear, as it was in the beginning when it was created. Because of man the sun

is half dark, rusty and befouled. On that day, God shall again cleanse and purify it by fire, 2 Pe 3:10, so that it shall be brighter and clearer than it had been in the beginning. But because the sun must suffer for our sins and lighten the most wicked knaves as well as more than the devout, therefore it longs in a heartfelt manner for that day, when it shall be cleansed again and serve only the devout with its light. So also the earth would bear no thorns or thistles, if it were not cursed because of our sins. Therefore together with all the creatures it longs for that day, so that it might be changed and renewed with them." That we certainly know that we still do not live as we should, but expect another life, which should be our real life. So the sun expects another glory, which it should have, together with the earth and all other creatures, namely, that it should be cleansed from all abuse of the devil and the world."

"This hope we have and the entire creation with us, which also for our sake shall be purified and renewed in the most beautiful manner. Then one shall say: This is finally a beautiful sun, a fine, pretty tree, an exquisite, lovely flower, etc. Now since that is our hope, I say, should we be so haughty? Should we consider the simple suffering, which might befall us in this life, so great? For what is that over against the glory which shall be revealed in us?" "In this manner St. Peter speaks of the change of the creature in his Second Epistle, 3:10-13 and says: 'The heavens will pass away with a roar and the elements will be destroyed with intense heat. "We are looking for new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells." As if he would say: Just as now on earth the most part do not do the will of our Lord God, as it is done in heaven; thus on that day also on earth shall be righteousness and holiness. There will be truly devout, blessed, righteous people. Just as there is real righteousness in heaven and the devil is cast out: thus shall he be cast out from the earth together with all the godless on the last day. This is so that truly holy people shall be in heaven and earth, who shall possess all things in complete joy. That is what St. Peter means, when he says: "We are looking for new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells." But St. Paul adds to that that not only we wait for this, but also the whole creation groans and cries with us and waits for it." "The creature knows that it shall not only be free from the service of the corruptible essence, but shall also be gloriously adorned and embellished. It knows how beautiful it shall be. Therefore it yearns and is anxious for it. So, we Christians also yearn and would gladly (desire) from the heart that there would soon be an end to the Turks, the Pope, and the shameful world."

This interpretation of Luther's needs no further interpretation on our part. It

is self-evident that what he says regarding the fine, beautiful trees, lovely flowers, etc., is only a childlike, poetical description of the conditions of the paradise on the new earth. Only one thing might still be said, that in the above Luther takes the ματαιότης, to which the creature is subjected, very correctly as "destruction." But then, when he expands the concept of ματαιότης and understands in that also the service, which the creature at the time of sin must render to the godless, then it is indeed questionable, whether the expression ματαιότης also contains this thought. On the other hand, it is beyond question, that this latter also belongs to the curse to which the creature is subject.

Vv. 23-27 οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.

"And not only this, but also we ourselves, having, the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting eagerly for our adoption as sons, the redemption of our body." In v. 22 the Apostle had returned from the future to the present condition of the creature. And now from v. 23 on he describes the present time of the Christians. Οὐ μόνον δέ, so he continues, scil. πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις στενάζει "all creation groaning." Not only the whole creation groans, but also we Christians groan. Many variants occur here. Behind οὐ μόνον δέ the words ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ are most certainly original. On the other hand, behind the participial clause καίπερ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες B reads: καὶ αὐτοὶ, Δ'AC: ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ, KLP and Mnn: καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ. The first reading is adopted by Tischendorf and many recent exegetes. The last is the textus receptus (a Greek text of the New Testament which Erasmus prepared). Evidently all the variants give essentially the same sense. To us the second reading, which has for itself the authority of the Sinaiticus and the Alexandrinus, seems to fit best. For ἡμεῖς necessarily belongs here, as Godet correctly judges, "in order to permit the contrast between the believers and nature to come forth." And to this is added καὶ αὐτοὶ in the sense of "likewise, also" (Meyer). Thus this is the meaning: Also we ourselves, we Christians, likewise groan, even as the entire creation groans. And so we groan, even though we possess the first fruits of the Spirit. Many expositors take the genitive τοῦ πνεύματος in the expression τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος as a genitivus partitivus (partitive genitive). Some, as, for example, De Wette, Olshausen, and Meyer, understand under the first fruits of the Spirit the Spirit,

whom the Apostle and the first Christians in general had received, in contrast to the Spirit, whom the later generations of Christians should receive. But a distinction of that kind is otherwise never found in the New Testament. The Apostle speaks with ἡμεῖς, "we," in the name of the Christians of all times. Others, as, for example, Tholuck and Philippi, place the gifts of the firstfruits of the Spirit whom we have become partakers here on earth, in contrast to the future full harvest of the Spirit. But the blessing of eternity is not otherwise designated in the New Testament as a complete outpouring of the Spirit. In our passage that which we Christians still wait for is called υἱοθεσία and ἀπολύτρωσις. In the first half of the 8 chapter Paul had simply spoken that the Spirit of God dwells in us and that we have the Spirit of Christ. That would be an entirely new and strange thought, that we first possessed only a part of the Spirit. Therefore with Bengel, Weiss, Hofmann, Luthardt, Godet, and Hodge we take τοῦ πνεύματος as a genitive of apposition. We Christians, who have the Spirit, possess in and with the Spirit, the firstfruits of the heavenly glory. Because the Holy Spirit dwells in us, we, as it were, already carry a part of heaven in our hearts. Similarly in Eph 1:14 the Spirit is called the earnest of the future inheritance, ἀρράβων τῆς κληρονομίας "deposit of inheritance." In 2 Cor 1:22 the same appositional designation is found, ἀρράβων τοῦ πνεύματος "a first installment of inheritance," which is the guarantee which consists in the Spirit. But even though we now possess the firstfruits of the Spirit, we still groan ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν "we groan within ourselves," we groan intus in animis nostris (within our soul). Out of the depths of our souls rise up groans, which then often also become audible in quiet or strong cries of complaint. We groan, like the creature, under the strain of the δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς "slavery to corruption." We Christians are not Stoics. The sufferings of these times affect our hearts. We painfully experience the woe of death. But this groaning is at the same time, an ἀπεκδέχασθαι, certainly among us Christians a real, conscious waiting and expectation. What we await is the adoption, υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, which according to the context is the perfection of the adoption. We are now already true children of God. The Spirit which we have received is a Spirit of adoption. Still our outward condition does not correspond to our right and station of adopted children. The adoption is still hidden, covered by the specter of the cross. Therefore we still groan, but wait at the same time for the changing of this condition and for the revelation of the adoption. We look for and wait for the glory of God, which shall be revealed in us, and which shall designate us as that which we are, namely, children of God.

This glory is designated and prepared for the children of God. The Apostle himself explains the expression *υἰοθεσίαν* by the added apposition *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν*. We yearn and wait for the blessed hour, when Christ shall deliver our mortal bodies from the bonds of vanity and of death. He shall glorify our perishable body, so that it shall be like His glorious body, *Php 3:21*. We Christians wait for the redemption of our bodies. The present time is still a time of yearning and waiting and it is brought to our attention very strongly in the following sentences, vv. 24-25, which explain the *ἀπεκδεχόμενοι* in v. 23. We translate *τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσωθήμεν* in v. 24a with Luther: "We are indeed redeemed, but in hope." With the *σωθήναι* the Apostle means in this context the *σωτηρία* in the pregnant sense of the word, perfected salvation, that which we call "blessedness." This is that which he had previously designated as *υἰοθεσία* and *ἀπολύτρωσις*. We are already saved and have become partakers of salvation. Salvation has been merited and prepared for us by Christ. Those who believe in Christ have eternal life, *John 3:16*. But the emphasis here lies on the *τῇ ἐλπίδι* which is placed at the beginning. We take this expression with Bengel, Meyer, Hodge, Philippi and others in the sense of "in the manner of the hope." Bengel: Dativus non medii, sed modi (The Dative, not of the means, but of the manner). Hodge: "The dative (*ἐλπίδι*) does not in this case express the means by which anything is done, but the way and manner in which it occurs. It is therefore analogous to our forms of expression that we have a thing in expectation or prospect. Salvation is a blessing we have in hope." Then when it reads further: *Ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς* "but hope that is seen is not hope," v. 24b, then *ἐλπίς*, "hope," is used in the objective or passive sense. "In an energetic manner in all languages the object of my hope is designated as my hope," Philippi. "For why does one also hope for what he sees?", *ὁ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει* v. 24c. "By means of *καὶ* it is designated, as groundless to add hope to seeing," Meyer. It lies in the concept of hope, that one does not yet have before his eyes and enjoy that for which he hopes. Hope and sight exclude one another. When one sees, there is no longer need for hope. Out of this discussion, v. 25 concerning the essence of hope the Apostle draws the conclusion: *Εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα* "But if we hope for what we do not see, with perseverance we wait eagerly for it," v. 25. This state of things, that salvation is at the time still an object of hope, not of sight, brings with it the fact that we still yearn and wait. In this time we Christians are destined to hope and thus placed into a yearning and waiting. Nevertheless, we wait in patience, really, "under patience," *δι' ὑπομονῆς*. We gladly and willingly bear all the suffering

of this time, since the waiting flows out of the hope. Christian hope is a sure hope which already includes the blessings of the hope. Thus also this description of the present time of the Christian is designed to comfort the suffering Christians and to reconcile them with their present lot and fate. Hodge very fittingly includes the content of the two verses, 24 and 25, in the statement: "Salvation, in its fulness, is not a present good, but a matter of hope, and of course future; and if future, it follows, that we must wait for it in patient and joyful expectation."

When the Apostle continues in v. 26: Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα etc., "And in the same way the Spirit also," etc., he thereby places this Person, the Spirit of God, beside the other two subjects. He had previously spoken of creation and the Christians, and says the same of the Spirit as of the other two. From v. 19 on he has explained that creation and Christians yearn, wait for and groan in that they wait for, etc. Now he adds that the Spirit also groans in like manner. For the Spirit the present time is a time of groaning. This expression concerning the Spirit in v. 26 ends with the statement ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῦς ἀλαλήτους "intercedes for us with groanings too deep for words." The expression στεναγμοῦς evidently corresponds to the συστενάζει in v. 22 and to the στενάζομεν in v. 23. What is expressed concerning the Spirit before these words serves only to prepare them and to make them understandable.

Paul says concerning the Spirit: συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν "helps our weaknesses." For in any case it is to be read thus, not ταῖς ἀσθενείαις. The Spirit takes upon Himself our infirmities. That is as much as: Concerns himself with us in our weakness. Ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τινός means: to concern oneself with someone; συναντιλαμβάνεσθαί τινι : at the same time to assist someone whom one would help. This proper meaning fits very well into our passage. For they are weak whom the Spirit receives to Himself, and weak ones to whom life and movement is not entirely lacking. They cannot manage with their own power, but need the support, the powerful assistance of a stronger One. Wherein our weakness consists, and how the Spirit helps our weakness, is explained more fully in the following.

Τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῦ οὐκ οἶδαμεν "For we do not know how to pray as we should." The reading προσευξώμεθα is more attested than the other, προσευξόμεθα, which moreover says the same thing. According to the example of the ancient expositors, Philippi understands these words in the following manner. The Christian, overcome by the feeling of his weakness, does not know how to correctly strike upon either the content (τί) or the form (καθὸ δεῦ) of the prayer. But τί and καθὸ δεῦ is one concept, the latter a modifier

of the former. Meyer explains: "We know not what we should pray for, accordingly as it is necessary, according to the measure of the necessity. The latter is the more closely designated instance. Plainly and in general it is not unknown to us what we should pray for, but what according to the given circumstances makes the need to pray." But there too much is placed into the κατ'ό. The meaning is simply this: We do not understand what we should pray for, how to pray, as it corresponds to the object of prayer. Similarly Hofmann, except that he refers κατ'ό δεῦ , which lies further, οὐκ οἴδαμεν . "And thus the meaning might much more be this, that we do not understand what we should pray for, and how we should pray for that which should be asked." In general, however, it is an error of most exegetes that they think that Paul here speaks of prayer in general, of the weakness of our prayers, and of this, how the Spirit helps us to pray. Thereby they go entirely out of the sphere of the thought of the Apostle. As, for example, also Weiss and Hofmann have recognized, that the present context treats a very precise petition and prayer, of a very definite object of the prayer. That is the future salvation and glory. We Christians groan at present. This groaning of ours, however, is at the same time also a waiting and a prayer. We groan for a fulfillment of the adoption, for the redemption of our body, and pray and plead for that. Our groans rise up to God out of the depths of the heart. Thus we indeed know something of the τί , which deals with the content of our prayer. We have the promise of the future glory. But we still have no adequate concept, no suitable notion of the glory which shall be revealed in us. Our power of comprehension is weak, and the promised glory is so immeasurably great and momentous, that we not at all comprehend it. Add to this that the suffering and woe of our time still suppresses us so, often completely overcomes us, so that the view into the bright, happy eternity is darkened for us. And so it happens that our prayer in no way corresponds to its object. We groan, pray, implore: Thy Kingdom come! Deliver us from evil! Lord grant me eternal bless! But this praying and imploring is still so weak, often so feeble and lame, as if the blessedness for which we pray were a very simple matter. "The distance between the need in which we find ourselves and the glory which we desire is so great that we cannot find the word of supplication to God, which suitably expresses the content of our yearning for redemption, which is so great for us." Hofmann.

That is our weakness, which corresponds so little to the immeasurable content of our yearning for redemption. But the Spirit Himself now has compassion for our weakness in this manner, that He intercedes for us with unutterable groanings, ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῦς ἀλαλήτους . That the Spirit enters in (or makes

intercession) for us, is shown sufficiently by the ὑπέρ in ὑπερεντυγχάνει , and the insufficiently attested ὑπέρ ἡμῶν is perhaps unnecessary. Most of the ancient expositors explain these words with Augustine thus: quod spiritus gemere nos facit (What breath makes ours to groan). And so also Philippi judges, that here the groaning of the sanctified spirit of man is traced back to its original author, the Spirit of God Himself. But the Spirit of God appears here not as the author of our groaning, but much rather as a subjectum gemens (subject of groaning), as a Person who Himself groans. When it is written that the Spirit intercedes for us with unutterable groanings, then that can mean nothing else than that the Spirit groans and with this groaning He represents us. "The Spirit must groan, if He is to represent us with groanings and if God is supposed to understand the πρόνυμα of the Spirit (v. 27)." Meyer. The Spirit is also the author of our groanings. The Spirit works in the Christians all spiritual motus (motion) and actus (impulse). However, these are only motus (motion) and actus (impulse) of the Christians, not of the Spirit. The Spirit works faith in us, but this faith is our faith, not the Spirit's faith. In our passage, on the other hand, Paul ascribes the groaning to the Spirit as subject and speaks of the Spirit's groaning. He coordinates, as already remarked, the groaning of the Spirit with the groanings of the Christians in v. 23 and thereby differentiates the former from the latter. The above mentioned explanation likewise does not agree with the expression ὑπερεντυγχάνειν . For that the Spirit makes us groan and teaches us to pray, is something different from the fact that the Spirit intercedes for us. Certainly the Spirit of God groans in us. The Apostle here describes an event within us. Out of our hearts the groans of the Spirit arise to God. Man is an instrument of the groaning of the Spirit. We feel and experience something of this groaning and yearning of the Spirit in our hearts. This often becomes audible in physical groanings, which our breast and our mouth bring forth. Still there are groanings of the Spirit, which a Christian can differentiate from his own groanings. The Spirit of God is an independent Person, who speaks, testifies and prays. As the Spirit of God bears witness to our spirit, speaks to and convinces us that we are children of God, so He also speaks in the children of God, out of their souls to God, and prays for us. Because they are groanings of the Spirit, therefore they are unutterable groanings, too high and too deep for us. We perceive them within us, but we cannot grasp them in concepts and clothe them in words. The Spirit's groaning is directed to the same object to which our groaning points, as also the groaning of creation, namely, for the freedom and

glory of the children of God. Self-evidently He prays for the same, not for Himself but for us. The good Spirit of God has a heartfelt sympathy with our weakness. He cannot, humanly speaking, see and endure it, that the children of God, in whom He has made His habitation, are regarded so poorly in this world. Therefore He enters into the arena for them and pleads for them the end of their suffering, their final glory. And with His powerful intercession, which we hardly understand, though we perceive it, He supports us. He lifts up and carries our weak groanings and prayers, so that they do not cease entirely, but rather finally reach their goal. There is no believing Christian who has not experienced something of this assistance, who has not tasted of this comfort of the Spirit. When the cross presses heavily, when we feel lonesome and forsaken here below, when we find no friend, no consoler, no man who really understands what troubles and encumbers us, when our prayer and lamentation would not flow freely, then we sense within ourselves an indefinable, inexpressible plaint, groaning and yearning, which goes through marrow and bone. It may even move the organs of the body. It is a mighty groaning and lamentation, which soon draws us out of our misery and gives us a taste of the powers of the future world. It is as if another One, a stronger One took hold of our trembling heart and raised it up to God, so that we can now again look up to God and pray more joyfully and confidently. That is the support, the intercession of the Comforter, namely, the Holy Spirit. But if we also do not feel and experience much of such things, then we still know from the mouth of the Apostle and should believe it, that He Himself, the Spirit of God, dwells and works in us. He speaks, groans, prays and with His groanings and prayers intercedes and will intercede for us, will stand by us, lift us up and bear us even to our final groan.

He Himself, the Spirit, intercedes for us with unutterable groanings. For God, however, the Apostle adds in v. 27, that this His speaking is well understood. He who searches the hearts and thus sees what goes on in them, He understands very well what the Spirit wills and means with His groaning. He knows that He intercedes for the saints in a manner agreeable to God. With Fritzsche, Meyer, Hofmann and others we take ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων in apposition to τί τὸ πρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος and thus likewise as object of οἶδε . For these words can contain no basic declaration, since God, the revealer of hearts, knows everything that takes place within man and what is contrary to God. They can at best establish why God accepts and hears the groaning of the Spirit. But this must be expressed otherwise as through οἶδε . Concerning the ἐντυγχάνειν , the representative groaning and prayer of the Spirit, it is here emphasized that it

happens κατὰ θεόν . That does not mean: according to God's intention, will and pleasure. For only of the Christian, but not of the Spirit of God, can it be said properly that He conforms to God's will and good pleasure. The κατὰ θεόν evidently corresponds to the καθὸ δεῦ in v. 27. We Christians on our part do not understand how to plead and pray for the future blessedness and glory, how to do it properly, how it befits so great a benefit. We still cannot correctly grasp that for which we hope. The Spirit, on the other hand, prays, asks for us the glory καθὸ δεῦ , as it is proper, or, what is the same thing, κατὰ θεόν , in a manner suitable to God and the glory of God. Similarly the adverbial modifier κατὰ θεόν in 1 Pe 4:6 is applied, where it says of the departed believers that they live according to the spirit in conformity with God, ζῶσι κατὰ θεόν πνεύματι "they may live in the spirit according to the will of God," that is, to lead a blessed life and existence similar to God. The Spirit very well understands that which we do not fully understand. He knows exactly what our hope is. He is at home in that world. He is Himself God and knows God, knows and sees the glory of God. The δόξα θεοῦ is His own, therefore He is also called τὸ τῆς δόξας πνεῦμα , the Spirit of Glory, 1 Pe 4:14. And in conformity with that He intercedes for us. With holy, divine earnestness, as it is fitting for the immeasurable, divine content of our hope, with the fervor of divine love He prays for us to God. He longs for the divine glory and petitions it for us. God's Son, our Redeemer, is our Advocate. That is an ἐντυγχάνειν κατὰ θεόν , when the Son says to the Father: "Father, I desire that they also, whom Thou has given me, be with me where I am, in order that they may behold my glory, which Thou has given me." John 17:24. With similar words the Spirit of Christ intercedes for those in whose hearts He dwells and whom He would fully prepare for salvation. The Apostle here designates as saints the Christians for whom the Spirit intercedes. The Spirit is zealous and troubles Himself for those whom He sanctifies, in whom He has begun the new, spiritual, divine existence and life, that they might be perfected. He claims for the saints the inheritance of the saints in light. And that the Spirit now intercedes for the Christians in such a manner is thus well known to God. God knows the mind of the Spirit, and it is self-evident, that such divine prayer is pleasing to and heard by God.

The Apostle has described the present status quo (the state in which anything is, the state existing) of the Christians. The present time is for him, as for the creation which surrounds him, and for the Spirit who dwells in him, a time of groaning. Certainly the groaning of the Christian, like that of the creature, is at the same time a waiting and watching. But also the groaning of the Spirit

is directed toward the future; the Spirit asks glory for the saints. That is a strong comfort for the suffering Christians. And at the same time in these last verses, which speak of the unutterable groanings of the Spirit, there is again a reference to the incomparable greatness of the future glory. This glory far surpasses our petition and understandings. It is understood only by God and His Spirit. Thus the entire context from v. 19 on serves as a confirmation of the statement of the 18 verse. The boundless greatness of the glory which shall be revealed in us is the basis of the comfort which the Apostle asserts in vv. 18-27.

Vv. 28-30

Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλυτοῖς οὖσιν.

"And we know that God causes all things to work together for good to those who love God, to those who are called according to His purpose." v. 28. With the words Οἶδαμεν δέ. , "And we know," by means of a δὲ μεταβατικόν , the Apostle adds a second to the first basis for comfort. After he previously pointed to the greatness of the glory, he names a second characteristicum (characteristic) of the future glory. When Hofmann, Godet and others take the adversatively and contrast the sentence introduced thereby to the description of the sad present time of the Christians, then they overlook the principal thought of the previous exposition. "We know that God causes all things to work together for good to those who love God." Πάντα , all things, thus also the sufferings of this time, συνεργεῖ , really, "work with," then more commonly: "are useful, helpful," εἰς ἀγαθόν , for the good, for the best, thus also for the glory which Paul had in mind in the entire section - and namely for those who love God, τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεόν . That is a customary description of the believing Christians. Eph 6:24. For those who love God, God has prepared salvation, namely, eternal life. To them God has promised the eternal Kingdom. 1 Cor 2:9; James 1:12, 2:9. The relationship of love, in which the Christians stand over against God, includes and brings with it that God does everything in love, for good to those who love Him and continue with Him in all temptations. Finally, He shall give them eternal life and glory. How tribulations help the believing Christians to glory, the Apostle had presented in 5:4-5. Our love to God, however, is never in any respect a basis and cause of salvation, it is only a via regni (way of salvation), not a causa regni (cause of salvation). To those who love God all things are helpful to glory. The certainty that that is so, οἶδαμεν , is confirmed in that which is expressed in the added appositional clause,

τοὺς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοὺς οὕςιν , "to those who are called according to His purpose" or "since they are called according to the purpose." Evidently it is expressed that in the circumstance that they are called according to the purpose. Their cause of their certainty is here expressed. The divine effect of grace, by which they have been brought to faith and called into the Christian congregation, guarantees to them that God must order everything for them for salvation, so much the more so because it rests on an expressedly divine purpose." Weiss.

Those who love God are at the same time the called, οἱ κλητοί . We here remember what we have remarked concerning this latter concept in 1:6, and supplement that which was said there. Κλητοί is with Paul, in general in the Apostolic Letters, consistently a predicate of the believing Christians, the same as they are otherwise called πιστοί "the believing ones," ἅγιοι "the holy ones," ἀγαπητοί "the beloved ones." This idiom is generally recognized by ancient and modern expositors. Fritzsche writes:

(Paul does not confuse various conceptions of men called and chosen. Οἱ κλητοί is constantly the honorific title to him of the Christians as divinely summoned and invited men, just as otherwise Christians are honorably called οἱ πιστοί as men conspicuous by faith οἱ ἐκλεκτοί , as men chosen from the dregs of rejected mankind, οἱ ἅγιοι as those consecrated to God, and by other names (1 Th 1:4; Col 3:12).

[Non commiscuit Paulus diversas hominum invitatorum et electorum notiones, sed οἱ κλητοί constanter ei honorificus Christianorum ut hominum divinitus arcessitorum s. invitatorum titulus est, quemadmodum alias Christiani οἱ πιστοί ut homines fide conspicui, οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ ut homines ex improborum hominum collivione delecti, οἱ ἅγιοι ut Deo consecrati aliisque nominibus (1 Th 1:4; Col 3:12) honorifice dicuntur.]

Philippi remarks: "In the apostolic letters sent to the Christian congregations, it is in the nature of the relationship, that καλεῖν , κληῖς , κλητός always refer to believers, in whom the call of God has actually or presumably become effective." He then continues: "Now when Paul also continually applies the predicate κλητοί only to those in whom the divine κληῖς has reached its effect, that means, to such persons who have accepted the call. This is so that "called" and "actually called" coincide; but it cannot then be said that κλητός has the meaning: "effectively called." For the effective meaning is not expressed in the predicate "called," but results only from the condition of the person." Certainly the subjective response in itself, that the persons concerned have on their part responded to the call of God, is not contained in the concept

κλητοῦ . Κλητοῦ autem dicuntur non ratione obsequii et acceptionis vocationis. Calov. Here God alone is the acting subject, and man is the object of the activity of God. God calls and man is called. But really "the effective impetus" lies in the expressions καλεῖν , κλησὺς , κλητός , when it is said of the Christians that God has called them. For κλητοῦ in the purely objective sense of the word are all men who have heard this Gospel, also those who have not complied with the same. Therefore κλητοῦ in this sense cannot be applied as a distinguishing mark of the Christians. The matter stands thus: God, who wills that all men should be helped and who through Christ had prepared salvation for all, calls to Christ through the preaching of the Gospel all who receive this preaching. He sends out His servants, the preachers of the Gospel, and they invite to the marriage feast, all those whom they can reach with their voices, to share in the salvation of Christ. Thus all men to whose ears the Gospel has come are κλητοῦ in the sense of invitati (invitation). And so the Lord uses the expression κλητοῦ in Mt 20:16 and 22:14. Unfortunately most men reject this call, this invitation of God and do not become obedient to the Gospel. But those who have complied with the call of God, who have accepted the Gospel in faith, have not done that of themselves. God has worked faith in them. Through the preaching of the Gospel, in which He offers salvation to them, God has also called them inwardly. He has taken hold of their heart, their will, placed the word of consent into their hearts, and has called, drawn and brought them to Christ. "With the effective κλησὺς the Gospel has pierced their hearts." Lange. Thus they are κλητοῦ in the pregnant sense of the word, not only as invitati (invitation), but as Usteri and Rueckert express themselves, as arcessiti (call), as such who have been brought in by the call of God. God has called them, ἐκλήθητε "you were called," into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ, εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, so that they now have fellowship with Jesus Christ. 1 Cor 1:9. God has called them, καλέσαντος , that is, translated them out of darkness into His marvelous light. 1 Pe 1:9. In the above quotation Weiss defines the κλητοῦ in our passage very correctly as "the divine act of grace, by which they are brought to faith and called to the Christian congregation." Only, one must combine this effect of grace with the outward vocatio (invocation). For it is by the Word that God has worked that in them. This divine act of grace is identical with conversion. And by virtue of such a call those who have become Christians then have come to love God. The final purpose of the call, however, is the blessed goal to which we Christians aspire. God has called us to eternal life, 1 Tm 6:12, to His eternal glory. 1 Pe 5:10; 2 Th 2:14. Already at the time of our call

and conversion, when we became Christians, God placed the future glory in prospect for us. He there placed our feet on the way of peace, the way which leads to eternal life. Therefore through our call there is guaranteed to us the future glory and with that even the sufferings of this time which are helpful to us for glory. For God, who has called us, is faithful, 1 Cor 1:9, and shall also certainly fulfill the promise to which we are called.

The security for the fulfillment of salvation, which is given to us in and with our calling, appears so much more firm and certain, since it rests on a purpose of God. We are called κατὰ πρόθεσιν, in conformity with a purpose, as a result of a divine purpose. All manner of possibilities have been laid into this πρόθεσις. One takes the purpose of God somewhat as the general will and plan of salvation, as the decree of redemption, and at the same time as the establishment of the way and means of salvation. That is sheer arbitrariness. The expression πρόθεσις states merely that God determined something. What He determined must present itself from the context. In our passage κατὰ πρόθεσιν is combined with κλητοῦς. God had thus determined to call, to convert, to lead to Christ and through Christ to save and with Christ to glorify just those persons who now love God, and are Christians. The latter is the purpose of the call. And the calling is accordingly the carrying out of this divine purpose and decision. The calling is a historical event, it falls into this present time. The divine purpose, which is realized in the calling, lies on the other side of time. It is an act within God which took place before time was a purpose which God had made by Himself in His eternal counsel, πρόθεσις, ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ "which He purposed in Him," Eph 1:9. It is a πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων "the eternal purpose." Eph 3:11. According to the matter in hand, this eternal purpose is identical with the eternal election. And so it applies to that which Weiss states concerning the election and its relationship to the calling: "Election and calling are inseparable correlate concepts. Where the one is the other is also, only that we cannot identify the former as an act within God before time, but the calling appears as an historical fact." Jahrbuecher fuer deutsche Theologie 1857, p. 79. We Christians should thus know that God, to speak with our Confessions, already from eternity "had ordained in His purpose, that and how He would bring us to Christ, to faith to salvation. And accordingly I have now been called, have been brought to Christ, to faith. Likewise the final purpose of the calling shall be fulfilled in me. I shall certainly in the future receive a share in the glory of Christ. For the eternal purpose of God, in which also my salvation is included, "can," as the Formula of Concord says, "not fail and

be destroyed. What a man proposes often comes to shame. But what God has purposed is carried out certainly and surely." The purpose, by virtue of which we Christians are called to Christ and to eternal life, is πρόθεσις τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦτος κατὰ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ "having been predestined according to His purpose who works all things after the counsel of His will," Eph 1:11, the purpose of Him who works all things and carries out what He has undertaken for Himself.

It is still to be pointed out that strictly Reformed theologians according to the precedent of Augustine place the called κατὰ πρόθεσιν in contrast to the called μὴ κατὰ πρόθεσιν. They add the Calvinistic dogma that, when the non-elected ones are called, this is not an earnestly intended and powerful call and that here the call has no effect, because the divine purpose is lacking. But that sort of differentiation of two classes of called ones, those who are called with a purpose and those who are called without a purpose, is foreign to the teaching of Paul. Likewise it has no support in Ro 8:29. We have shown above that in this passage the word κλητοί has another, a narrower meaning, as, for example, in Mt 20:16; 22:14. Therefore one cannot place the κλητοί, of whom the discussion is here, and the κλητοί, of whom the discussion is there, into one category. One cannot take them as one genus (origin), which then falls into two species (kinds), those called with and those called without a purpose. In our passage, Ro 8:29, as in general in the apostolic Letters, κλητοί are those gathered in, arcessiti (call), the converted. And of those Paul says in general that they are called according to the purpose. According to the instruction of the Apostle we Christians should regard our calling, our conversion in the manner, that a deliberate eternal counsel and purpose of God had been realized. It has not happened by chance that we have been called and converted to Christ. If we rightly consider this grace which we have experienced and also the eternal grace, and truly take it to heart, then we cling with our thoughts and with our hearts to this grace. We do not think of the others who have heard the same Gospel and are not converted and not saved. What their lot is is written upon another page of the Bible. Where the Scriptures speak of the many who are also called, that is, the invitati (invitation), and are nevertheless lost. For example, in Mt 20:1ff.; 22:1ff.; 23, 37, there they do not use the expression κατὰ πρόθεσιν, likewise not the contrasting μὴ κατὰ πρόθεσιν. There they do not in general operate with the purpose of God. There Scripture states merely that God has called and invited these people through the Gospel, and indeed earnestly and effectively. God has failed in nothing concerning them, but has done everything

that He could to save them. They on their part have hindered the effect of the Word, persistently resisted the Holy Ghost, who would also convert them. They "would" not and are therefore themselves responsible for their condemnation. And we should abide with these Scriptural thoughts and not introduce that which Scripture says of the called in other places, and in other connections. There they are called in a special sense, in a pregnant sense of the word κλητοί .

When we now look over the following sentences, which are introduced with ὅτι , vv. 29-30, then it immediately appears that the expressions προέγνω and προώρισε correspond to the κατὰ πρόθεσιν and ἐκάλεσε to the κλητοὺς οὖσιν in v. 28. Thus the expression τοὺς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοὺς οὖσιν , likewise establish with this expression that everything serves for the best to those who love God. Here the Apostle speaks so indefinitely: οὖς--τούτους καί , because he would call to our attention that to those, to whom the first point applied, the second, the third, etc. also applied. He also wants to emphasize that the divine acts named here hang closely together, form, as it were, one strongly joined chain. But it is evident that he has the same persons in view, whom he had previously designated as called according to the purpose. These are those who love God, as children of God, the same persons who are now Christians, with whom he includes himself in the entire section, vv. 18-39, in the ἡμεῖς , ἡμῶν , etc.

Concerning them he declares first of all: οὖς προέγνω , literally translated: Whom He had previously known. A number of church fathers, the Lutheran dogmaticians of the 17 century and a good part of the modern theologians refer this expression to the foreknowledge of God and translate: "whom He had foreseen," "known beforehand." Since the foreknowledge of God includes all things, all men, good and evil, here however the discussion is only concerning those who are now Christians and shall finally be glorified, therefore, one must supplement the text in order to bring sense and understanding into this interpretation. The ancient dogmaticians explain: quos credituros praevidit in this manner that they gain their election intuitu fidei (God's predestination is based on the faith or lack of faith at the moment of death). So also Philippi and Godet: "whom He had seen beforehand in this quality as believers," Meyer: "Whom He knew beforehand as such who in the future would be on the way of His divine salvation - τάξις σύμμορφου τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Weiss: "Whom He had seen beforehand as lovers of God." Those are nevertheless completely arbitrary explanations, arbitrary glosses to the text. With the same right, that is, error, the Romanists supplement fide justificamur (justifying faith) with caritate formata (formed by love). Precisely the main element must be invented supplemental. This explanation brought from ancient times belongs to the

linguistic impossibilities and opens every door and gate to all exegetical arbitrariness. Οὓς προέγνω "whom He predestined" is in itself a separate part of the sentence and προέγνω must be a complete concept by itself. It designates, like the following verbs, an act of God which has man as object. This is not an act of man about which God only knows, which He saw already beforehand, and just, as the προ points out, so likewise πρόθεσις designates an eternal act of the will of God. Thus Augustine, Calvin and the Reformed, and also Luther and the Lutheran theologians of the 16 century, and among the modern ones, for example, Rueckert, Usteri, de Wette, Fritzsche, Lange, Delitzsch, Hofmann, Luthardt and Cremer have understood προέγνω. When Meyer and others, on the other hand, remark that this explanation offends the colloquial usage, then it is to be considered what Lange writes: "The reminder of Meyer, that προγινώσκειν in the classics never means anything else than the foreknowledge, is here, where we have to do with a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the center of the Christian doctrine of salvation, without any consequence." In profane Greek the expression is used only of men. There always, as, for example, also in 2 Pe 3:17 it was clearly indicated, what one has known in advance. And if a personal object is present, then the meaning is that one already knows someone, from a former time. Thus Paul also speaks in Acts 26:5: προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν "since they have known about me for a long time." It is an entirely different matter when the discussion is concerning a πρόγνωσις of God. Such a thing was entirely unknown to the Greeks also in the sense of praescientia Dei (foreknowledge of God). Yes, πρόγνωσις θεοῦ is a specifically Christian concept, although not a biblical terminus (term) for divine foreknowledge. We must now, examine the colloquial usage more closely in order to determine the content of the concept exactly.

It is not necessary that we enter into all the manifold definitions and nuances of the concept of the verb γινώσκειν, as for example, Cremer designates. It is sufficient that we establish the pertinent usage for our passage as far as it is of importance. It is first of all a generally recognized fact, of which every Greek lexicon gives testimony, that γινώσκειν in classical Greek often designates a judicial verdict and also other decisions and decrees. The expositors quote as proof passages, for example, Herod. 4:25; 1,74.78. Thuc. 4,30; 3,99. The substantive γνώμη also means "decree" and γνωμὴν ποιεῖσθαι, "to pass a decree." It is indeed well known in that this meaning is not authenticated for the compositum (agreement) προγινώσκειν. But that lies in the nature of the case, since a decree of man, which precedes time and is thus eternal, never takes place. It is simply a matter for God, and the heathen know nothing of eternal divine decrees.

In biblical Greek, on the other hand, the meaning decree, decision, predestination for προγινώσκειν is established by Acts 2:23. There we read: τοῦτον τῇ ὠρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἔκδοτον διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνέλατε

"This man, delivered up by the predetermined plan and foreknowledge of God, you nailed the cross by the hands of godless men and put Him to death." Here ἡ ὠρισμένη βουλή καὶ πρόγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ is one concept and thus πρόγνωσις is related to βουλή. And evidently not the foreknowledge but only the earlier determination is God's basis and motive for the giving of Christ into death. From the beginning God had made the decree and had reached the decision to deliver Christ over into the hands of His enemies. Accordingly the Jews have raised Christ to the cross through the hands of the Gentiles. The Hebrew ידע "to know" in Gn 18:19 and Jr 1:5 corresponds to the Greek γινώσκειν in the sense of decision, determination. In both passages ידע is combined with a personal object. In the first the meaning is that God had observed, determined Abraham to the point (ידיד), that he would teach his children the way of God. In the second, the meaning is that God had decided upon, had chosen (ידיד) Jeremiah as His prophet. In the New Testament προεγνωσμένος is found stated of a person, namely, Christ, 1 Pe 1:19-20, the words ἄμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων "a lamb unblemished and spotless the blood of Christ. For He was foreknown before the foundation of the world, but has appeared in these last times " cannot state anything else than that God had ordained Christ as Redeemer of the world already before the foundation of the world. Then He manifested Him in the last time, caused Him to come into vision. Keil here defines προγινώσκειν as an "act of the will, according to which God appropriated for Himself in advance this Person, who is called Christ." It is more probable that προεγνωσμένος in this place refers not to an appropriation on the part of God, but means simply a praeordinatus (preordained). A synonymous expression is the ὠρισμένος in Acts 10:42: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν "the one who has been appointed by God as Judge of the living and the dead." Corresponding to this usus loquendi (the way in which a word is used in ordinary speech), Luther now translates the οὓς προέγνω in Ro 8:29: "whom he has predestined beforehand), Selnecker likewise. Luc. Osiander: "whom he has predestined Chemnitz and the Formula of Concord: quos praeordinavit, elegit (whom God predestinated, elected). Brenz: quos praeordinavit (whom God predestinated). And so throughout the Lutheran theologians of the 16 century. With this Usteri, Ruecke and de Wette agree. Fritzsche: "Concerning whom he made a decision beforehand."

Certainly the unmodified προέγνω "to know beforehand" designates an act of

the will of God, a divine decision. Only thus does it gain sense and content. Still we must think of another linguistic, in order to understand the connection of the προέγνω with the bare οὕς . In the last quoted Scripture passage it is clearly presented to what God had designated or ordained the person concerned, Abraham, Jeremiah and Christ. In our passage there is found with προέγνω no such designation of purpose. This appears only with προώρισε . Therefore we are here led to that pregnant meaning of the verb γινώσκειν , which we have already met in 7:15. We refer to what was remarked there. Γινώσκειν in the New Testament, like $\gamma\tau$ in the Old Testament, now and then means as much as: "to grant consideration to someone, to form a connection with someone, or to stand in such (a connection)." Cremer. We recall several characteristic passages, in which God is the subject and man is the object of γινώσκειν . We read in Ga 4:9: νῦν δὲ γινόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ "But now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God." With these words the Apostle reminds the Christians of their conversion. That was the beginning of our Christianity, that we knew God, have known and received God as our God, and thus have entered into communion with Him. Basically this γνωῖναι θεόν is basically nothing else than γνωσθῆναι ὑπὸ θεοῦ . Only thus does one learn to know God, that one is known of God. God has known us, that means, He has directed His attention to us, turned to us, laid hold of us with His Word and Spirit, worked in us the right knowledge of God, faith, and thus made us His own. This is an energetic, effective knowledge, a nosse cum effectu (to know with the purpose). Luther: "Thus our knowledge is that we are known of God, who has also worked this knowledge in us (for he speaks of faith), thus He has known us first." "That is thus the meaning of the word, 'you are known of God.' This means, you have been visited through the Word, you have been presented with faith and the Holy Spirit, through whom you have been renewed, etc." A similar expression is found in 1 Cor 8:3: εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ "but if anyone loves God he is known by Him." To this Meyer remarks very fittingly: "The speech is pregnant. Instead of saying in logical minuteness of detail: 'thus in this is found, not only the knowledge in the correct manner, but also the being known of God takes place.' Only the latter is spoken, the greatest, whereby the former is understood of itself. The ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ presents the great value of God's love. When God recognized a man, then it is not some indifferent and ineffective relationship of God to man, but an activity of God, which applies to man. In this he experiences as object of the divine knowledge also the effect of the intention, thus love, care, etc. The concept is therefore the divine knowledge which becomes the effective (knowledge) as an inner experience of man, which is the causa

salutis (cause of greeting). God, who knows man, completes with him the relationship of salvation which (He) desired in His decision." And thus this is also the meaning in the well-known saying in 2 Tm 2:19: ἔγνω κύριος τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ "the Lord knows those who are His," that the Lord has made those who now belong to Him into His own through His effective knowledge. The abiding effect of this first knowledge, through which we have become the Lord's own, is then that the Lord knows His own, the Shepherd knows His sheep, and is known of them, καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκονται με "And I know My own, and My own know Me." John 10:4. That is an intimate, inner communion of love, a nosse cum affectu (to know with love). A Christian "should console himself with this and be certain that he has in Him (Christ) the beloved Shepherd, who knows him, that is, accepts him as His sheep, cares for him, and would protect and save him." Luther. In the same sense, as the verb γινώσκειν in the quoted passage, the verb יָדַע is used in Amos 3:2; Ho 13:5. Through Amos God speaks to Israel: יְדַע יְהוָה אֶתְּכֶם כִּי אֶתְּכֶם בָּרָא יְהוָה וְעַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁכַּח אֶתְּכֶם וְיִשְׁכַּח אֶתְּכֶם. "You only have I chosen among all the families of the earth" "יָדַע" here does not mean "to know," "to learn to know," "to take cognizance of someone" (Hitzig), but "to recognize." The divine recognition, however, is not a mere taking notice, but energetic, taking man into its most inner essence. It is a laying hold and penetrating with divine love ... and essentially similar to the election." Keil. The result of that was that God already recognized Israel in the wilderness, as Hosea writes, which means "interested Himself in them," "showed His love and care for them." (Keil).

And now corresponding to οὓς προέγνω our passage states that God in advance, in His eternal purpose and resolution, has "regarded" us in His grace, namely the persons who are now Christians. He "fixed the mind upon us" (Hodge), and has occupied us for Himself, has decreed us to Himself, and thus already claimed us for His own. Self-evidently this foreknowledge of God is not the same sense effective knowledge, as that through which we are converted. It is still not the knowledge which takes hold of, grasps and permeates its object. For the foreknowledge is an eternal act of God, which is a decree, preordained of God. The persons whom God foreknew were not living at the time when God preordained them. At that time we existed only in the eyes, in the decree of God. In this eternal counsel of His, God had thus appropriated us for Himself, adjudged and ordained us for Himself, so that in time, in the above-described manner, we should become His own de facto (that which in fact does exist). The most adequate translation of οὓς προέγνω might be: (A.V.: "whom he did foreknow"). Πρόγνωστος has the same sense in 1 Pe 1:1-2, where κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς "according to the

foreknowledge of God the Father" more closely determines the concept ἐκλεκτοῦς . You are elected - that is the meaning there - according to that, that God the Father already in advance, from eternity had chosen you for Himself. Even those modern exegetes, who have thoroughly investigated the concept γινώσκειν προγινώσκει, agree with this explanation. Hofmann writes: "There is a recognition by God, which is something different from a mere knowing of the object of the knowledge or perception of the nature of the same, while a right knowledge is an appropriating (knowledge). Thus an acquaintance with a relationship of purposeful action; also the same divine knowledge, which is called προγινώσκειν , is meant in this sense everywhere, where this expression occurs in its full value and is used without a predicate of the object. Thus (it is) an action, which directs itself in an appropriate manner to the subject, before it has made it in advance, into an object of a knowledge, as one recognizes related and similar things." If one here evaluates the concepts "related" and "similar," which also can be dispensed with, then that is naturally to be understood so, that the appropriating recognition by God makes the object of the recognition analogous and related to the recognizing subject. Cremer translates οὓς προέγνω in Ro 8:29: "with whom God has entered into a close relationship in advance."

But those whom He previously chose for Himself, "he also predestined to become conformed to the image of His Son," καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ . Προώρισε is the real terminus (term) for predestination and is in itself no independent concept, but is always combined with a modifier, which shows to what someone is predestinated. Both expressions, προέγνω and προώρισε , describe one and the same eternal counsel of God. Therefore here before καί , the τούτους is lacking, but with different significance, the first contains the reference to God, the latter the reference to the goal. The accusative συμμόρφους is grammatically an accusative of the predicate, actually a designation of the purpose and goal. Those whom God had chosen beforehand, He had also designated beforehand that they should be conformed to the image of His Son. They should be similar in their outward form and appearance to the image of His Son, who through suffering has entered into glory and whose divine δόξα now also shines forth out of His physical form and appearance. This is that they should bear the image of the heavenly man, 1 Cor 15:49; that their perishable body should be glorified and should be similar to the glorified body of Christ, σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ "conformity with the body of His glory." Php 3:21. This designation of purpose is further explained by the following words: εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς "That He might be the firstborn among

many brethren." The expression προτότοκος and ἀδελφοί here do not point to the fact, as many commentators would have it, that Christ is the original and essential Son of God and that through Him we have become children of God per adoptionem (by adoption). For in all the words added to προώρισε only the future status gloriae (state of glory) is described. The meaning is much rather that in the great family of God, in the multitude of the perfected children of God, Christ should occupy the position and honor of a firstborn, of a dux (ruler) and princeps (leader). He is certainly the prince, ἀρχηγός, of our salvation, who leads many children with Him to glory. He 2:10. That is the content and tendency of the divine predestination; a great troop of blessed, glorified, perfected men, which is gathered about the glorified, perfected Son of Man, the God-man. We who are now Christians are thus predestined to glory. God wills and has firmly established that those whom He has chosen for Himself and selected as His possession shall at one time also see His glory and become partakers of the glory of Christ. Our future glorification rests upon an eternal decree of God and thereby upon a firm, immovable foundation. And just for that reason, everything, even cross and suffering, must serve for our good, and result in salvation. The meaning of the σύμμορφους etc. concerning the conformitas crucis (obedience as conformity to the cross), which is found in many ancient expositors, does not fit correctly into the individual expressions and into the context, which the Apostle has chosen here. That our cross and suffering is foreseen from the beginning by God does not give any basis for the fact that the cross leads to glory. The basis of the statement is v. 28a, given in v. 29, the certainty of the future glory, falls down likewise, when one bases the same on the praevisio fidei (the faith that God saw beforehand), on the foreknowledge of the subjective human conduct. οὓς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν. καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν. οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν "And whom He predestined these He also called and whom He called, these He also justified and whom He justified, these He also justified." Thus the Apostle continues the discussion, in which one part is closely related to another. Those whom God predestinated and chose for Himself beforehand, them He also has called, that means, as noted above to κλητοῦς οὖσι : to call to Christ, to draw to Himself, to bring to faith. With the calling, with conversion, justification is given and established. Those who have come to faith God has also justified, has declared and accepted them as His beloved children. Thus those whom He had chosen for Himself previously have de facto (that which in fact does exist) become His own in time. "And whom he justified, these he also glorified," ἐδόξασε, that is

as much as already glorified. The glorification is indeed still in the future, but it can and shall not fail to appear. "In order to place the glorification on the same level of certainty with the προέγνω , προώρισε , ἐκάλεσε , and ἐδικαίωσε , Paul chose the proleptic Aorist." Weiss. How the future salvation and glory is established and guaranteed by the justification, he explained in 5:9-11. On the other hand, according to the Scriptures, as has been shown above, the eternal glory is the ultimate goal of the calling. Those whom God has called and justified, He shall certainly in the future also glorify, as He has in His eternal decision already predestinated them to glory. Thus the Apostle here in v. 30 names divine acts, which fall into this time, resp. in the end of time, and which are nothing else than a carrying out of His eternal decisions. The πρόγνωσις of God is realized with the calling and justification. The called and justified are already on the way to glory. And in the future the divine προορισμός , the predestination to glory, shall be realized with finality when the believing, justified children of God are glorified with Christ. Decision and realization in the presentation of the Apostle and also realiter (actually) are inseparably bound together with one another. And what the Christians have experienced already in time of the realization of the divine decree makes it so much more certain for them that the suffering of this time. This only serves and is beneficial to them in their glorification.

Thus in the section, vv. 28-30, the Apostle has brought to light the certainty of the future glory which is rooted in the eternal counsel and purpose of God. The certainty of glory is the second basis for comfort which he presents to the suffering Christians, after he had previously comforted them with the greatness of this glory.

The above-explained passage, Ro 8:28-30, has been accepted in the Church from ancient times as a locus classicus (Bible passage frequently used to prove a point) for the doctrine of the eternal election. Thus we would briefly compile the principal points of the doctrine, which present themselves in this word of Scripture. To begin with it is to be considered that the Apostle comes to discuss the eternal decree of God, which one generally calls the election by grace, after he had presented the principal articles of Christian doctrine, of sin and of grace, of justification and of sanctification. Now first, where he turns the eyes of the converted, justified and sanctified children of God to the future inheritance, does he point to this decree of God concerning their salvation. It is therefore not in conformity with Scripture, when with Calvin, one makes predestination the basic principle out of which one brings forth the entire Christian doctrine. The

doctrine of the election by grace is according to the Scriptures an especial comfort for the believing Christians, who walk in the Spirit and look for the future glory, and is also correctly grasped, esteemed and made good use of by these alone. The Apostle further knows only a predestination to eternal life and speaks not a syllable of a predestination to damnation. The latter is a fiction of the Calvinists, which gives their entire doctrine a bitter aftertaste. It is an unlawful conclusion, a fallacy, when out of the προορισμός, of which Paul speaks, one makes a conclusion a posteriori (with examination) on the fate of those who are lost. The biblical text offers no support whatsoever for that. The characteristic of the eternal election or predestination of God is that it has to do with definite persons, οὗς-τούτους, concerns "each and every person of the elected ones," as the Formula of Concord expresses it: "goes only over the children of God, who are elected and ordained to eternal life." Yes, these persons are the children of God, those who love God, those who are now Christians. In the apostolic Letters the expressions "called," "saints," "beloved," and "elected," are used altogether promiscue (indiscriminately). And in our Lutheran Confessions the other names: "Christians," "children of God" alternate with the title "Elect." When the Scriptures speak of the elect, of those whom God has chosen and ordained beforehand, we should think of the believing Christians and include ourselves in the number of the elect. When the Scriptures speak of the Christians, the believing children of God, then we should identify the same with the elect. Certainly only those are the elect, who continue in the faith unto the end and are finally glorified. But the Scriptures consider and describe the believing Christians throughout as persons whose continuing characteristicum (characteristic) is faith and who also receive the end of faith, the salvation of their souls. And so in the explanation of the Third Article Luther defines the Christian Church or the congregation of saints or believers as "the entire Christianity," which the Holy Spirit "has called, gathered, enlightened, and sanctified - and kept with Jesus Christ in the one true faith." To be sure, experience teaches that many who have come to faith fall away again sooner or later. The Scriptures earnestly warn against apostasy and also speak of "seasonal believers." But what has to do with the seasonal believers belongs to another page of the Scriptures. It is another truth, which we should not introduce into the expressions of Scripture concerning the election of the children of God. These passages treat unto eternal life only of the persons who believe and will be saved. The eternal election or predestination, which refers to specific persons, is therefore according to the concept, as according to the essence differentiated

from the decree of redemption or establishment of the way of salvation, as well as from the general gracious will. The decree of the eternal election includes in itself that God chose for Himself, selected for His possession and predestined to heavenly glory each and every person of the elected ones, before the foundation of the world. He firmly proposed to save these persons and then also in time to lead them along the way of salvation, to call and justify them. And this purpose of God cannot fail. In conformity with this purpose He has called, converted and justified us, and He shall certainly finally glorify us. Our calling, conversion, justification and preservation is a carrying out of the eternal decree and purpose of God. Or in other words, in order to speak with our Confession, the eternal election by God is the cause not only of our salvation, but also of our calling, conversion and justification. Faith flows out of the election, and not turned around, the election out of faith, out of the praevisio fidei (the faith that God saw beforehand). And therefore we Christians should reason a posteriori (with examination) from our calling, conversion and justification to the eternal election, to recognize the election in our calling and justification and thus to become certain of this, that we also belong to the elect and shall receive the eternal glory. This apostolic doctrine concerning the eternal election, as it has come to expression in Ro 8:28-30 and is confirmed by similar Scripture passages, as Eph 1:3ff.; 2 Th 2:13ff.; 2 Tm 1:9; 1 Pe 1:1-2, is very comforting for us Christians. When we are anxious and troubled about our salvation, then we should know that God from eternity has taken into His almighty hand our salvation and everything that belongs to it, thus also our faith. And this doctrine grants special comfort to the Christians in their cross and suffering. When the sufferings of this time press heavily and also overwhelm the soul, when it appears as if God had forsaken us, then we should say to ourselves that God already before the time of the world had thought of us. God looked upon me in grace and chose me for His possession, which He certainly will not fail to do. When our cross afflicts us spiritually, when it appears as if God is angry with us, then we should say to ourselves, that God from the beginning has meant it only well with us and has chosen and ordained us to an eternal glory. Therefore also all the severe experiences of this life only lead us onward toward the goal, which God from eternity has firmly established in its place. If we here with our thoughts remain only in the sphere of thought of the Scriptures and correctly apply and grasp to our hearts the comfort of the Scriptures, then we do not think of others with whom there is another condition. Then we feel no tendency to speculate upon the lofty article of the eternal predestination and remain protected against the dangers

which such speculation of the reason includes.

Vv. 31-39

The Apostle continues in v. 31: Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα ; "What then shall we say to these things"? What follows from this? In this entire last section of the chapter, vv. 31-39, he amplifies what presents itself for the Christians from that which was spoken previously, vv. 28-30, from the eternal decree and purpose of God and its fulfillment in time. It follows from this: Εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν ; "If God is for us, who is against us"? First of all it follows that God is for us, stands on our side. "God, who has designated us to glory and carries this determination onward towards its realization with a sure hand, can only be for us." Weiss. But from that it follows again: "Who can be against us?" The self-supplied answer is: No one. Paul does not deny that the Christians still have enemies, but that these enemies can still make valid charge against them. Τίς καθ' ἡμῶν ; is a triumphant question and has the sense: Who will rise up against us with success? Who can do us harm?

(Paul does not deny that there are grave enemies against pious Christians - this he affirms. Therefore the question of a judgment arises regarding the cruellest enemies against His own whom God protects: is it permissible to despise them and regard them as nothing?)

[Non negat Paulus, graves hostes piis Christianis exstituros esse - illud affirmat, adeo non vel acerbissimis inimicis adversus eos, quos Deus protegat, consilia successura esse, ut eos contemnere et pro nullis putare liceat. Fritzsche.]

"It is a question not of defiance (Hofmann), to which the following does not agree, but of the sure already triumphant certainty, that all hostile power must be unsuccessful and harmless for us." Weiss. Yes, since we have God on our side, therefore no one can harm us - or more precisely: be obstructive to salvation. For the entire context treats of the future salvation and glory. The enemy seeks to make salvation questionable for us. But without success, because God, who has designated us to glory, is for us, and no one is able to accomplish anything against God. God will not permit that anyone should take salvation from us.

ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται "He who did not spare His own Son, but

delivered Him up for us all, how will He not also with Him freely give us all things?" v. 32. The question introduced with πῶς joins itself most easily

to the preceding relative clause, if one takes this as protasis, as a paraphrase of the subject. The Apostle here again points to the highest proof of the love of God. God has not spared His own Son. The expression recalls Gn 22:16, where God says to Abraham: "You have not withheld your son, your only son." It was a unique sacrifice, since Abraham out of love to God did not withhold his own son. But that is only a weak image of the incomparable sacrifice, which God has brought to man out of love. Christ was and is the only, ὁ υἱος, Son of God; with right He calls God His own Father, ὁ υἱος πατέρα. Jn 5:18. He is born out of the essence of God, the only Son of this kind, the μονογενής, John 3:16, and therefore the beloved Son of the Father, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, Col 1:13. Him God has not spared, but delivered Him up for us all as He gave Him into death. Here, where he speaks in the first person plural, Paul includes himself with all the believing, elected children of God. Fritzsche: "Nam de piis Christianis Paulus toto loco disputat vv. 28,31,33,35ff." (For Paul in the entire section vv. 28,31,33,35ff. discusses believing Christians). Christ is certainly the atonement for the sins of the whole world. But the believers are those who draw to themselves and apply to themselves this love and this proof of the love of God and thus say: Christ has died for us. The ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is to be understood here even as in v. 31, since the great love of God is praised here. God has given His Son into death for our benefit. Indeed the death of Christ, when one looks into the matter, serves to our benefit only then, when Christ has suffered death in our place. And because God has done that, how should He not also with Christ give us all things? The words πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ belong together, quidni etiam (why not even now). The Son of God appears here as the greatest gift of grace, all other things as accompanying supplements. The latter cannot be lacking, if one has received the former. We take τὰ πάντα not with Hofmann as the "all of things," the future world, but as all that which we still wait for and hope from God. We think however, according to the entire context, especially of the future salvation and glory. These can and shall not fail us, after God has offered His greatest gift in His own Son. Here occurs the same argumentation as in 5-6ff., where Paul concluded from the highest proof of the love of God, our atonement by the death of Christ, a majori ad minus that the future σωτηρία could not fail. Thus this statement in v. 32 serves as a confirmation of the preceding v. 31.

The question: τίς καθ' ἡμῶν :, which governs the entire section, is now divided up into several individual questions, "whose triumphant answer shows how little the called need to fear any antagonism." Weiss. The continuation of thought in the following verses Godet has very correctly defined thus: "The three following

questions are only somewhat altered applications of that in v. 31: 'Who can be against us?' The first two (vv. 33,34) refer to attacks of a juridical nature; it deals with enemies who contest the claims of the believers regarding forgiveness and salvation. The third (vv. 35-37) refers to a violent attack, in which the enemy resorts to brutal force in order to destroy the bond between Christ and the believers. The entire passage reminds strongly of Is 50:7,8: "And I know that I shall not be ashamed. He who vindicates me is near: Who will contend with Me? Let us stand up to each other; Who has a case against Me? Let him draw near to me. Behold, the Lord God helps Me; Who is he who condemns Me?"

The next question reads: Τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ : "Who will bring a charge against God's elect?" v. 33. The meaning is: Who shall and can accuse the elect with success, so that the charge shall be accepted? The Christians, to be sure, have opponents who accuse them. "The question is completely general and thus includes all imagineable earthly, hostile powers, Satan, Law, conscience, world, etc., without wishing to designate anyone of them or to point them out exclusively." Philippi. The enemies mentioned accuse the Christians before God, and they also confirm their charge. The believing Christians are still not entirely without guilt. We all daily sin much, and we do much against the Law of God. These sins and transgressions of our's Satan, the real accuser, brings before God's tribunal. Our fellowmen complain that we have offended them often and severely. Our own conscience declares us guilty. Nevertheless these complaints are untenable. The Apostle shows that already by the fact that he calls the accused the elect of God. Thus he here designates those whom he had previously called προεγνωσμένοι and προωρισμένοι, because God had chosen them for Himself out of the world, out of the massa perdita (lost people). John 15:19. "The elect of God are beyond all accusation. After God has once taken them to Himself, let anyone bring against them whatever charges he will, it can do them no harm. They cannot cause them to lose the inheritance promised by the election." Hofmann. The accusation is dashed to pieces in the θεὸς ὁ δικαίων. "It is God that justifies." Those whom God has chosen for Himself and predestinated to glory He also has called and justified. Thus the Apostle had written previously. And thus justification appears here also as a result of the election, as a characteristicum (characteristic) of the elect of God. God, who is the Judge in this matter, does not give ear to the complaint against His elect, but pronounces over them an acquitting judgment. He absolves them of their transgressions and daily and richly forgives them all their sins for His Son's sake, whom He had given into death for them, for the atonement of their guilt.

It reads further: Τίς ὁ κατακρίνων "Who is he that condemns?" v. 34. Who is able to condemn the elect of God? The parallelismus membrorum (parallel portion) demands that we take these words as an independent question and not, as many expositors do, as an addition to θεὸς ὁ δικάων . Likewise it clashes with the structure of the discourse, when one finds hereby the way to dismiss the thought whether God or Christ would condemn us. No, ὁ κατακρίνων "one who condemns" is the same person as ὁ ἐγκαλῶν "one bringing charges against." It is certainly only a formal rhetorical separation and division of thoughts belonging close together, that the accuser would differentiate from Him who condemns and would place the first One, God, the Judge, over against the second One, Christ, the Advocate of the accused. The description of this unique process is completed here. Those opponents who would accuse us before God because of our continual sinning, intend to condemn us with this complaint to procure for us from God the judgment of condemnation. Every judicial charge aims at this, that the accused would be condemned. And certainly every sin, even when it is committed by a Christian, is in itself damnable and shuts man off from God and salvation. Nevertheless, our adversaries do not gain their purpose. "Christ Jesus is He who died, yes, rather, who was raised," Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀποθανών, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς . The μᾶλλον δέ "is the imo vero vel potius, by which the speaker improves himself." "Self-evidently this entire application of the corrective expression is here only of a formal nature, serving the fact that the two phases come forth correctly marked in their important correlation." Weiss. If Christ has died the death of the sinner only as an ordinary man, then certainly His death if of no benefit to us. By His resurrection He has been effectively proven as the Son of God and His death as effective for atonement and salvation. Cf. 4:25. The emphasis, however, lies on the two following modifying clauses: "who is at the right hand of God, who also intercedes for us," ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν . Christ now sits at the right hand of God of equal power and honor with God. And when He therefore intercedes for us before God, pleads for us, when we sin, cf. 1 John 2:1, then this petition of His certainly cannot fail of its goal. The intercessio Christi (the intercession of Christ) is the continual pleading of His bloody merit before God and to be taken not only as realis (real), but likewise as vocalis et oralis.

Thus all the "juridical attacks" of our adversaries prove themselves as vain and fruitless. They can accomplish nothing against us with their accusation and condemnation, cannot dispute our salvation, to which we have been chosen by God from the beginning. The worst enemy of our salvation is sin, which still adheres

to us. That in particular gives our adversaries occasion for complaint and condemnation. But this proof of guilt is and shall be invalidated and depreciated by Christ's death, atonement and intercession. And thus the final result, the concluding sentence in this trial is: God, the highest Judge, speaks, declares, and regards us as justified. There the matter rests in eternity. To the just, however, belongs salvation.

In the following verses the Apostle comes to speak of attacks of another kind, of "violent attacks" (Godet), which are pointed directly against our person, while the attacks of the first kind injure us indirectly, are supposed to dispose God to deny us salvation. Therefore the next question has the following style: τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ : "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" v. 35. The love of Christ to us is meant by ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ not our love to Christ. For we are bound together only by the love of Christ, "can thus also only be separated by something from without." Hofmann. In this Letter Paul has already sufficiently praised the love of Christ, also again in the immediately preceding verses. Christ has delivered Himself up for us, has died for us, has atoned for our sins, and pleads for us without ceasing. With Christ and with the love of Christ we are bound together through faith. Faith is the bond which unites us with Christ. Thus the question, whether anyone can separate us from the love of Christ, is followed by the other question: can anyone destroy the bond of the communion with Christ, cause our faith to waver, divert us from faith? The meaning here is also that no one is able to do that. In vv. 28-30 the Apostle comforted the Christians with the certainty of their future glory. This has its basis in their eternal election. And now in v. 31 he sees in the Spirit enemies raising themselves up, who would tear away from the Christians the salvation awarded to them. First of all in this manner, that they accuse us before God on account of our sins and summon God to condemn us. That these efforts are fruitless was proven in vv. 32-34. Salvation is and remains certain for us, in spite of the accusations of our adversaries. Therefore the latter attempt to get at us in another manner. In Christ alone is justification and salvation. And Christ is our own, we possess Christ through faith. If faith falls away, then the connection with Christ is broken, then also our salvation is lost. Therefore the enemies of our salvation seek to separate us from Christ and His love and set upon us with every might and power to cut off our faith in Christ.

The question τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει etc. is continued in v. 35. The entire second part of the question reads: Can tribulation or anxiety or persecution or hunger or nakedness or danger, danger of life, or sword, death by the sword,

separate us from the love of Christ? The Apostle here, in that he comes back to the sufferings of this time, enumerates things, while the *τίς* which stands at the head of the verse, points to persons. There also are tribulations named here which befall the Christians for Christ's sake, which the hostile world brings upon the Christians, and which the princes of this world stir up for them. The question includes the thought that the Christians actually experience such evils. And this fact Paul confirms in v. 36 with a quotation from the Old Testament, Ps 44:22, where the ecclesia (church) of the Old Covenant complains: "But for thy sake," that is, for God's sake, "we are killed all day long." There are always martyrs among us. "We are counted as sheep for the slaughter." That is the fate of the Church of all times. But all that, cannot separate us from the love of Christ, cannot divert us from faith. We do not allow the love of Christ to be obscured by the most turbid tribulations. "But in all these things we overwhelmingly conquer through Him who loved us," *ὑπερνικῶμεν* . v. 37. They can do to us what they will. We persevere and stand fast in faith, in confidence in the love and grace of our Redeemer. We stand and conquer in faith also the most severe temptations and perversities. Our faith is the victory which overcomes the world. Yet this is not in our own power, but "through him that loved us." The genitive *διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς* , is better attested than the accusative *διὰ τὸν ἀγαπήσαντα ἡμᾶς* . Christ, who has loved us and given Himself for us and who now sits at the right hand of God and has all the hostile powers in His hand, supports and strengthens His own, the elect of God, with His strong arm, with His divine power, and holds them firm in His Word and faith. Thus we continue in faith, because Christ keeps us in faith. The perseverance of faith is the Lord's work and action. The same connection of thought, which we have presented here, is established by Weiss, when he writes: "Precisely because the love of Christ gives us the very power to overcome everything which would separate us from this divine love and thus makes the individual case, in which we can no longer experience this love (because we have fallen from faith), an inconceivable case. Nothing can separate us from it."

The certainty that suffering and tribulation cannot separate us from the love of Christ, however, rests upon the other certainty, that nothing in general that belongs to the realm of the created, can separate us from the love of God in Christ. This latter statement, vv. 38,39, the Apostle introduces with *πέπεισμαι γάρ* : "I am persuaded," firmly convinced, persuasus sum, omni victa dubitatione (I am persuaded, all doubt being overcome) (Bengel). This conviction of Paul was not grounded on some special revelation, which had been imparted to him personally,

as some have supposed in a foolish manner. Here also Paul speaks in the name of all believing Christians, namely in the first person singular, because he would hereby dispose every individual Christian to speak thus with him: "That neither death nor life," neither the death of which the discussion was in v. 36, nor this earthly life with its changes, "nor angels nor principalities," ἀρχαί, the latter the higher orders of angels, the angels, these high spirits, who are stronger than all visible creatures (hypothetically understood), as in Ga 1:8, (if they wanted to and would tempt). "Nor things present nor things to come," neither the present time, which is often burdensome for us, nor the difficulty which the future might bring, "nor powers," δυνάμεις, which, if it is genuine, hangs together closely with the following expression, "nor height nor death," nor adverse fate from above and no force of power from the depths, which proceeds from the powers hostile to God, from the evil spirits, "nor any other creature," shall be able to separate me, or rather, since the individual Christian includes himself with his fellow Christians, who are of the same conviction "shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," from the love of God, which God has proven to us in Christ Jesus, our Lord and Savior, and still continually proves, a fuller expression for the "love of Christ." Nothing in all the world, can and shall tear me away from the love of God in Christ, from God and Christ. Nothing, nothing can and shall cause our faith, our trust in God to waver. "The same love of God and of Christ, in which we stand, helps us, so that we remain in it. And therefore it cannot fail that we succeed to the pre-determined goal, which God's pre-temporal counsel decreed for us and whose realization is already so far advanced." Hofmann.

The certainty of the future blessedness or the certainty of salvation thus also includes this, that a Christian is certain of this, that he shall remain in the love of God and of Christ, with which he is bound in faith, or, briefly stated, that he shall continue in faith. This certainty is based on the eternal counsel and purpose of God, as also the Apostle deduces the entire amplification from v. 31 on from that which was said in vv. 28-30. In this section, v. 33, he designates the Christians as the elect of God. The Formula of Concord, very much in accordance with the matter, combines the two statements in v. 28 and vv. 38,39 into the sentence: "Because we are called according to the purpose of God, who shall then separate us from the love of God in Christ?" Those whom God has chosen from eternity and predestined them to glory, He has also called and justified. These He also keeps in faith and gives them the victory over all the enemies of their

faith, v. 37. Indeed the same Apostle, who has written the πέπλομαι in v. 38, warns the Christians in other places, in another connection, against apostasy, also in this Letter to the Romans, e.g., 11:20-22. This warning is meant for the Christians who would become proud, and careless, and in the end is beneficial and necessary for all Christians, because they all still walk in the flesh. But upon the suffering, tempted Christians, who are troubled about their salvation, the Apostle bestows real consolation and comforts them in this way. He assures them that no tribulation, in general nothing in the whole world can wrest from them, their faith and salvation. And this consolation applies to all Christians, for there are no Christians, who are not concerned about their salvation. Both things agree very well with one another, that the Christians on the one hand work out their salvation with fear and trembling, as if they could lose it at any moment, and therefore hold their flesh in bounds. On the other hand, in Spirit and faith they are certain of their salvation and of this, that they shall never fall away from the comfort of the true faith. This certainty is the opposite of carnal security and is no mathematical certainty, but a certainty of faith, an integral part of the Christian faith. Whoever calculates thus: Today I stand in faith, but who knows what it shall be in the morning? In the end I shall suffer shipwreck in my faith, before I reach the goal - he does not have the right Christian faith. Faith is certain of its case and of its goal. For faith the possibility that it would ever and for always cease, that it would ever leave Christ, is an inconceivable thought. A believing Christian is certain of two things, that no one can displace the goal for him, and that he also on his part cannot miss the goal. He depends and trusts unconditionally in the infallible divine Word, in which his eternal election, which cannot fail is revealed to him, and in which God has promised him that He shall keep him in faith unto salvation by His own power. This certainty comes not from flesh and blood, but is, even as faith in general, a work, a miracle of God in man, a divine certainty effected by God, which therefore shall be master over all the dangers, which lie in one's own flesh and blood, and maintains the upper hand over all fear and doubt.

Already at the end of the second part of his Letter, chapter 5, the Apostle had pointed to the future σωτηρία, as the result and fruit of justification. At the end of the third part, where he deals with the Christian cross, which also belongs to the Christian life, and calls attention to the comfort in the cross, he holds the thoughts of his readers firmly at length within the vision of the heavenly glory. He comforts them with the greatness and with the certainty of the future glory. Glory, however, is not only an end and conclusion of the Christian suffering, but in general an end and goal of the way of salvation, which

the Apostle had followed step by step. And so the second half of our chapter and especially the closing part, vv. 31-39, is a fitting conclusion to the entire previous presentation of doctrine. Even the central dogma of justification is again touched upon here. The discussion of the Apostle here comes to an end with an epilogue, which belongs to the most magnificent which has ever been heard and proclaimed in human language. Augustine quotes this passage as an example for the grande dicendi genus. The blind Erasmus cried out in astonishment: Quid usquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius? (What did Cicero ever say with greater eloquence). The powerful rhetoric, however, is only the correct form for the exalted, divine content. For what we read here is not ordinary speech and eloquence, but a "holy hymn" (Philippi), which is inspired by the Spirit of God, and as it were lifts up all who pray it after Paul to the heights of heaven. It is a hymn of victory and triumph, with which a believing Christian overthrows and treads upon all enemies of his faith and salvation, and soars upward to his God and his Christ and firmly clings to Him, until the triumph of faith passes over into the triumph of eternity, of glory.

The summary of the entire section, 8:18-39, we can finally put into the words: The Apostle reminds the Christians of the fact that the present time is a time of suffering, that they must now suffer, wait in expectation, wait, groan and pray. He comforts them with the future glory, and certainly with the greatness of the certainty of the glory.